



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

AH 47PA U

Harvard Depository
Brittle Book

THE
THREE TEMPLES
—
BISHOP HINDS

Hinds

יהוה



THE THREE TEMPLES

OF

THE ONE GOD.

BY

SAMUEL HINDS, D.D.,

LATE BISHOP OF NORWICH.

. . . ἵνα εἰδῆς πῶς δεῖ ἐν οἴκῳ Θεοῦ ἀναστρέφεσθαι, ἢτις
ἰστὶν ἐκκλησίᾳ Θεοῦ ζῶντος . . .

S. Pauli Epist. Prim. ad Tim. c. iii. v. 15.

THIRD EDITION.

LONDON:
JOHN W. PARKER AND SON, WEST STRAND.

1857.

621

Hinds.



31, 192

PREFACE.

THIS publication comprises, with much additional matter, the substance of two Sermons, preached before the University of Oxford, on the morning and afternoon of Whit-sunday, 1829. In it, as is indicated by the title, I have claimed for a scriptural use of the word *Temple* an importance which may not, at once, be recognized by all. Whether I am warranted in assigning this importance to it, the reader must judge. At all events, he will not regret, I should hope, having been led to consider, more attentively than he may have previously done, how much of revealed truth has been conveyed to us through language made up of this and its kindred expressions; and not only by those who "spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," but by Him also to whom "God gave not the Spirit by measure."

Digitized by Google

CONTENTS.



INTRODUCTION.

	PAGE
All Revelation progressive, but especially that whereby God has revealed <i>Himself</i> —The three stages in this Revelation—Why called <i>Temples</i>	1—6
The proposed view of the three Temples to embrace—I. Their dedication, and the signs whereby they were declared to be the temples of God—II. The resemblances and differences between them . . .	7—8

CHAPTER I.

DEDICATION OF THE THREE TEMPLES.

Sign accompanying the dedication of the Temple of stone—The correspondence between this and the sign given at the baptism of Jesus, the Temple of “God manifest in the flesh”—Confirmed by the account of his Transfiguration—The Church, or the Temple of the Holy Ghost, dedicated, and its dedication accompanied with the like sign on the day of Pentecost	9—15
The Christian Body, and not any <i>place</i> of worship, properly <i>our</i> Temple—The practical importance of this view, and the impediments to its habitual application	15—21

CHAPTER II.

THE RESEMBLANCES AND THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE THREE TEMPLES, AND FIRST, IN RESPECT OF THEIR MATERIALS.

The first Temple suited to the weakness and prejudices of the Israelites—the third Temple to an improved spiritual, moral, and intellectual state—the second, to the period of transition	22—29
---	-------

The first Temple accommodated to a <i>partial</i> dispensation, the third to one that is universal, and the second to the change from the one to the other— The present dispensation incompatible with a Temple of stone—with the return and abode of Christ in the flesh amongst us—and with the claims of the papal throne	29—34
The first Temple adapted to a gradation of spiritual privileges—the third to an equal participation—The residence of the Immanuel on earth under the present dispensation, inconsistent with this view .	34—37
Proper notion of God's abode and presence to be derived from the foregoing view	37—40

CHAPTER III.

THE RESEMBLANCES AND THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE THREE TEMPLES IN RESPECT OF THE DIVINE INDWELLING.

The first Temple contrasted with the second and third, in respect of the connection between the presence of God and the Temples themselves	40—44
The three Temples contrasted in respect of their oracles —Oracle appended to the first Temple—Christ's instructions the oracle of the second Temple— The Bible the oracle of the third Temple—Fitness of these several modes of communication to the several periods and stages in the Divine dispensations—What we must believe respecting the inspiration of the Scriptures, if we recognize them as our Divine oracle	44—54

CHAPTER IV.

THE RESEMBLANCES AND THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE THREE TEMPLES IN RESPECT OF THEIR SERVICES.

Religious service defined—Service of the first Temple a service of <i>action</i> —expediency of this, owing both to its prophetic character and likewise to the moral and intellectual degradation of the Israelites— Hence, a literal and minute observance required— This system adapted only to a partial dispensation	55—63
---	-------

PAGE

The service of the third Temple not only different from, but contrasted with, that of the first—A service of <i>words</i> —including <i>moral conduct</i> —No precise rules given for either—evidence to the truth of Christianity arising from this—Baptism and the Lord's Supper exceptions	63—72
To the second Temple no peculiar service attached, but only the training for one—The Lord's Prayer not an exception to this view	72—76

CHAPTER V.

**THE RESEMBLANCES AND THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN
THE THREE TEMPLES IN RESPECT OF THE PERSONS
OFFICIATING IN THEIR SERVICES.**

The priesthood of the first Temple typical, and its type fulfilled in Christ	77—79
Christ the priest of the second Temple, as well as the Temple itself—The atonement made by the Levitical priests typical, his real—they many, he one—they not exempt from sin, he sinless—their sacrifices oft-repeated, his one, once offered up	79—82
Two-fold office of the Levitical priest, sacrifice and intercession—the former fulfilled, and abolished by Christ; the latter fulfilled, but not abolished	82—84
Scriptural language respecting a priesthood attached to the Church—how to be understood—as to the office of sacrificing—as to the office of making intercession	84—91
What place the Church <i>collectively</i> and the <i>various orders</i> of the Church occupy in the comparative survey	91—96

CHAPTER VI.

**THE RESEMBLANCES AND THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE
THREE TEMPLES IN RESPECT OF THEIR DURATION.**

Inquiry into the ways of Providence, how far to be pursued—Application of the principle to the question, why the several Temples have so differed in duration?	97—102
--	--------

	PAGE
Duration of the Temple of stone such as was alone consistent with its design, as introductory to Christianity—explanation of the sense in which it was introductory	102—105
Christ's abode on earth, why necessarily brief—long enough for his part in the Christian scheme—and also for making us <i>personally</i> acquainted with Him	105—108
The Church to last as long as the world—meaning of the promise, “the gates of hell shall not prevail against it”—the length of time appointed for its duration not revealed—the practical view to which the inquiry should lead	108—111

CHAPTER VII.

THE CONNEXION OF THE THREE TEMPLES WITH THE DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY.

The view of God as <i>three persons</i> the natural impression arising from the differences between the three Temples—The historical facts of Revelation the first foundation of the doctrine of a Trinity—Consequent need of special provisions accompanying each change of Temple, for preserving the doctrine of the Divine Unity	112—115
Provisions attached to the first Temple prospective—Express declarations—prohibition against more than one Temple	115—117
Provisions of the second Temple—Recurrence of the “glory of the Lord”—Miracles identifying the Immanuel’s Divine nature with Jehovah—Occasional violation of the Sabbath by Christ—Hints and assertions by which He confirmed the impression so made—Evidence that such was actually the impression left on the minds of the Apostles	117—122
Provisions belonging to the third Temple—Allusions contained in the New Testament Epistles to the instruction of Christ on this point—The same Divine agency and attributes ascribed indiscriminately to the three Persons of the Trinity—The form of baptism, the main provision, peculiar to the third Temple	122—127

THE
THREE TEMPLES OF THE ONE GOD.

INTRODUCTION.

IN no view of Revelation is the wisdom of God more conspicuous than in the *slow* and *gradual* development of truth—the admission of more and more light, according as mankind have been able to endure it, and have been capable of walking by it. Contrast, for instance, the obscure hint given to our first parents, that the seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head, with the Christian doctrine of fallen man's redemption through Christ; and observe how progressively the original outline has been filled up and finished. The first intimation of a Redeemer, compared with our present knowledge of that great truth, was like the confused mass of colouring which the painter's canvass at first exhibits, and in which no eye but his own can discover a future form or meaning. Slowly it received touch after touch, and line upon line, until at length the understanding of a child may comprehend its import, and the

B

heart of a child be touched and awakened by it. So again, with respect to our knowledge of a future state. From a few passages in the writings of Moses, it may be *elicited* and *inferred*; in the long interval between Moses and Christ, a series of inspired messengers *suggest* it with increasing clearness; at length, the Finisher of our faith—the Author as well as Finisher—brings life and immortality to light by his Gospel.¹

Remarkable as this progressive system has been in the disclosure of all revealed truth, it has been more especially so in God's revelation of Himself. His immediate presence, his undelegated intercourse with Man, has gradually assumed a character more and more unlike our gross conceptions of any earthly or created object, until we of these latter days are found acknowledging the reality of the Divine presence and communion, without any sensible manifestation at all. To his first chosen people, He was made known as the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; and his presence was associated with a pillar of fire or a cloud, a tabernacle or a building of stone and wood. The Israelites were taught to

¹ St. Paul may, possibly, have intended to express this view of Revelation by the word πολυμερῶς, Heb. i. 6. It means literally, *in many parts or portions—piecemeal*.

address Him as especially present in an abode made by men's hands, as their forefathers are alleged by the woman of Samaria to have associated his worship with Mount Gerizim.¹ Their prophets, after a time, began to announce a new revelation of the Divine presence, in which the analogy to an earthly dwelling place, and a local existence was to be more distant and shadowy. "The Lord himself," said Isaiah, "shall give you a sign; Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel," *i. e.* as the Evangelist explains it, "God with us."² By the Immanuel's coming, the association of the Divine presence with a fixed local habitation had a new direction given to it, if it was not wholly destroyed. "The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory."³ A human Being was now exhibited to man as the resting-place of the Shechinah—the spiritual even more than the material portions of that human nature. But there was yet a further stage of revelation, to which the Immanuel himself directed the views of his Church. Not only that worship was to be done away with which con-

¹ John iv. 20.² Isaiah vii. 14. compared with Matt. i. 23.³ John i. 14.

nected the Divine presence with a mountain or a building—with Jerusalem or Gerizim—it was expedient that Christ, the human manifestation, should go away. He foretold a day, in which the true worshippers were no longer to say, “Lo, He is here,” or “Lo, He is there;” for the kingdom of God was to be “within them.” They were to worship Him as present by his Spirit only—present in no one place—in no one man—but by an indwelling, wholly spiritual, in his new body the Church, “the fulness of Him that filleth all in all.”¹

It is my purpose, to compare together these three successive stages, in which God has revealed Himself to us:—in other words, to contrast the three Temples of the One God. I call these three mediums of the divine presence, *temples*, because inspired wisdom has thought proper so to represent them, in reference to certain important points of analogy. Our Lord, for example, spoke thus of Himself; “Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up.”² His apostles held a similar language, saying, that “in Him dwelleth all the fulness of the God-

¹ Compare Eph. i. 22, 23; Luke xvii. 20, 21; Matt. xxiv. 23—27; John iv. 21—24.

² John ii. 19.

head;"¹ and, that "the Word was made flesh, and dwelt or tabernacled amongst us."² Again, with respect to the Church, St. Paul frequently reminds his Christian brethren, that they are "the temple of the Holy Ghost," and "the temple of God." In his first Epistle to the Corinthians he writes, "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you? if any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy; for the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are:"³ and in his second Epistle to the same Church, "What agreement hath the temple of God with idols? for ye are the temple of the living God; as God hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them."⁴ To the Ephesians also he writes, "Ye are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone; in whom all the building, fitly framed together,

¹ Col. ii. 9.

² Ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν. John i. 14. The expression seems to be an allusion to the tabernacle, to which the Divine presence was attached, during the period that was preparatory to the establishment of Israel in the promised land and the building of a temple. The correspondence between this period and our Lord's ministry, considered as preparatory to the final establishment of his Church, is obvious.

³ 1 Cor. iii. 16, 17.

⁴ 2 Cor. vi. 16.

groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord : in whom also ye are builded together, for an habitation of God through the Spirit;”¹ and to Timothy, “ These things write I unto thee,—that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the *House of God*, which is the Church of the living God.”² To the same source must be assigned the repeated use of the metaphorical expression “ edification ” or “ building up ;” and this, not by St Paul alone ;—it was no fanciful train of allusion which his peculiar habits of thinking suggested ; but an image derived from the very essentials of that Gospel which all the apostles alike preached. St. Jude, as well as St. Paul, speaks of Christians “ building up ” themselves on their most holy faith ;³ and in St. Peter’s Epistles, as in St. Paul’s, the exhortation to come unto Christ as “ unto a living stone, disallowed indeed of men, but chosen of God, and precious,” is followed up with the declaration, “ ye also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house.”⁴

¹ Eph. ii. 20—22. ² 1 Tim. iii. 14. ³ Jude 20.

⁴ 1 Peter ii. 4, 5. It is a remark of the learned Bochart, that, from the period of Christ’s death, the Temple at Jerusalem was never called by the Apostles *the Temple of God* ; but that they applied the title exclusively to the Church, or

The comparative survey which I propose to take will embrace, first, the Dedication of the three Temples, and the signs by which the Lord Jehovah intimated his acceptance of them as his temples ; secondly, a consideration of the Resemblances and the Differences between them, and also of the ends which appear to have been contemplated by these resemblances and differences. The first chapter will be occupied with the former of these subjects ; the next five with the latter ; and the seventh and concluding chapter with the view, suggested by the preceding, of the connection between the Three Temples and the progressive revelation of the Divine nature as a Trinity in Unity.

Such, reader, is the inquiry into which you are invited to enter—an inquiry which, with the full blaze of Gospel light to guide us, will remind us, at every step, of our weakness and blindness. It is the lifting up of the eye to Him who gives it sight ; it is the exercise of our understanding on Him, in whom “ we live, and

else to the individual Christian. The latter assertion—that the individual Christian, as such, is called the Temple, is incorrect.—*Bocharti Examen Libelli de Antichristo*, tom. ii. col. 1047. Cited by Bp. Newton on the Prophecies, vol. ii. p. 95.

move, and have our being." Enter we on it, therefore, with reverence and humility befitting a subject so high and heavenly; but let us, at the same time, do so, fully persuaded, that whatever it has pleased God to reveal to us of Himself, is like the burning bush on Mount Horeb,—it *is our duty* to turn aside, and draw near, and examine it; only remembering that the ground whereon we tread is holy.

CHAPTER I.

DEDICATION OF THE THREE TEMPLES.

THE dedication of the three Temples first claims our attention. There was a solemn consecration of each ; and a miraculous sign declared each, in succession, to be the abode of God—the appointed channel of his communications—in other words, his Temple.

To begin with the first—the Temple of stone at Jerusalem. The mark by which Jehovah testified to its holy character was given on the completion of the building, and preparatory to its use. It was formally and solemnly dedicated ; and, at its dedication, it was miraculously filled with a “glory,” or mysterious light.¹ With the meaning of this light, as the established sign of God’s immediate presence and undelegated communications, the Israelites were, at that time, fully acquainted. They remembered the Shechinah which had made known the abiding presence of the Lord in the Tabernacle, the pillar of fire which had conducted

¹ 1 Kings viii. 10, 11; 2 Chron. v. 13, 14, and vii. 2.

their fathers through the wilderness, and the lightnings that flashed from the summit of Mount Sinai on the delivery of the Law. They had also the record of the burning bush, out of which God called to Moses to appoint him their lawgiver and leader;¹ and, to add no more instances, they were familiar with that more awful record of man's exclusion from Paradise, which was accompanied with the display of "cherubims and a flaming sword."²

In manifesting this light then, at the dedication of Solomon's temple, God declared, by a symbol, the significance of which was understood by all, that it was the appointed place where men ought to seek and to worship Him—that there He was to be found when *called on*—that thither, as to the abode of the first *Paraclete*,³ the court of their heavenly Sovereign, both king and people, priesthood and laity, were to resort. Though, in the words of Solomon, on that occasion, "God

¹ Exod. iii. 2.

² Gen. ii. 24.

³ The etymological meaning of the term παράκλητος is one *called in*; and in reference to this may be explained all the significations which are claimed for it. God, as presiding over his Church, is *called in* by the afflicted to *comfort* them, by the ignorant to *instruct* them, by the weak to *strengthen* them.

dwelleth not in a temple made by hands," yet the circumstances of his presence here were analogous to the local residence of a human governor, and it was therefore called "the house of the Lord."

Christ's human nature was the next Temple to which God's presence and intercourse with man was attached. Considered in this point of view, his baptism corresponded to the dedication of the temple of stone. It was the period from which his holy service commenced. That, on this occasion, the same hallowed token of God's presence and indwelling was manifested as at the dedication of the temple of stone, is not, indeed, distinctly stated; but there is much reason to understand the sacred writers to be recording the descent of the well-known symbol—the Shechinah. The Spirit of God is said to have descended on Him, in bodily shape, like a dove. This must, surely, allude either to the easy motion with which the holy flame descended, or to the figure which it assumed; for no other semblance of a dove would have been recognised as betokening the Divine presence. The Shechinah was the well understood and long established symbol of this; and it was, we may, therefore, presume, the rekindled Shechinah which so de-

scended.¹ With this, as well as with the fuller display of it on the Mount of Transfiguration, was joined a voice from heaven, saying, “ This is my beloved Son.”

The repetition of these words, and their import at the Transfiguration more especially, deserves particular notice, in reference to the view which we are now taking of our Lord as the new Temple. On two favoured servants of God in old times this mark of his presence was known to have rested, and on two only—on Moses after he came down from Mount Sinai, and his face so shone that he wore a veil; on Elias or Elijah, when he was caught up into the heavens, seated on a cloud so irradiated.² It was by these tokens, perhaps, that the disciples recognised Moses and Elias, whom they had never seen, but with whom,

¹ The author of *The Gospel of the Nazarenes* mentions the appearance of “ a great light ” at our Saviour’s baptism. The independent authority of such a document is, of course, nothing; but it may, nevertheless, be allowed to strengthen a probability already resting on grounds certainly scriptural. The passage, to which I allude, will be found in Jones’s *Canon of the New Testament*, part ii. c. 25, §. 11. See also the remarks of Paley, on the allusions made to this tradition by Epiphanius and Justin Martyr. *Evidences*, part i. chap. 9, and *Fragments to Calmel*, DCXIII. and DCXXII.

² Called a chariot of fire, 2 Kings ii. 11.

so characterised, their Scriptures had made them acquainted. They, on that occasion, saw them both “in glory ;” to Moses and Elias, even as to Jesus, the Shechinah was attached. Were they, then, Immanuel too ? Were they (their hearts might have suggested) to be considered as Beings of the same order as their Master ? Were they, like Jesus, *temples* of the living God ? The suggestion was natural, and seems to have been anticipated by the voice that told them, “This is my beloved Son.” Twice to our Lord’s person this “glory” was appended, and, on each occasion, that same voice accompanied it, as if to guard against the possibility of its being supposed, that, in his case, it denoted no more than in the case of Elias or Moses. This was probably, indeed, the main purport of the Transfiguration. It declared Jesus to be, not like Elias, nor like Moses, an inspired man—but the Immanuel—the Christ—the Son of God—the Temple of his presence and communication.

We come now to the last great and glorious stage in God’s revelation of Himself—that, for which the preceding stages were preparatory. Christ had spoken of yet another Paraclete, for whose coming it was expedient that He should go away. He had told his disciples that He would

come again, but warned them against supposing that his new body, the future Temple of God, was to be even so local, as when God was present to them in Him. “And then, if any man shall say unto you, Lo, here is Christ, or Lo, He is there; believe him not.”¹ “The kingdom of God cometh not with observation, neither shall they say, Lo, here; or, Lo, there; for behold, the kingdom of God is within you.”² But this was not all; speaking of that event, which was to be the dedication of the third Temple as his baptism had been of the second, He indicated the correspondence between the two by a remarkable expression. Not long before his ascension, He commanded the Apostles, “that they should not depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the promise of the Father, which,” saith He, “ye have heard from me. For John truly baptized with water, (alluding, pro. ~~Je~~, to his own baptism by John,) but ye shall be *baptized* with the Holy Ghost not many days hence.”³ Accordingly, on the day of Pentecost, the mysterious emblem of God’s abiding presence and covenanted intercourse was once more manifested. On the assembled Church the Shechinah was poured out and dispersed.

¹ Matt. xxiv. 23.² Luke xvii. 20.³ Acts i. 4, 5.

The metaphor of “pouring out”¹ is used as if to denote that it was the Church’s spiritual anointing. It was, in the language of St. John,² the unction from the Holy One. The Church became the Lord’s anointed. It was the Church’s baptism; it was the dedication of the last Temple of the One God.

It is this view of the Christian Church throughout the world, and of each separate Church, and its several congregations, that entitles it to be called the Temple. No building made by hands corresponds to that which was honoured, of old, by the abiding presence of Jehovah. We, the worshippers of God, are now his Temple. Buildings of stone we have, indeed, which are dedicated to God’s service; but if any analogy must be sought for these from an earlier dispensation, it will be found rather in the Jewish *proseuchæ* or synagogues. Our Churches at all events, correspond to the Temple at Jerusalem. Of no literal edifice in the Christian world has it been written, that the Holy Ghost dwells in it, and has

¹ Ἐκχεω. Acts ii. 17.

² 1 John ii. 20. See also ver. 27, where he speaks of this anointing “as *abiding in*” Christians, and as “*teaching all things*,” expressions used by our Lord in his promise of the Comforter.

filled it with his presence; but only of that figurative structure, in which we are “lively stones.” Whatever reverence, therefore, may be due to places set apart for Divine service, that reverence ought neither to supersede, nor yet to be confounded with, the sense of God’s presence which we are required to attach to the *congregation*. They, and not the walls that occasionally enclose them, are the dedicated Temple.¹

And yet, it is sad to reflect on the cold-hearted indifference with which this, the true sanctuary, is regarded, even by numbers who value the good-tidings of the Gospel. Has Christ indeed gone and left us comfortless, that we must look back for the source of our holy love and zeal to days of miracle and manifestation; and stand gazing with misapplied enthusiasm on the goodly stones of an earlier Temple,² unmindful of that to which the Shechinah has been transferred? How poor, after all, is that use of Christian privileges which awakens no habitual sense that God is present, and Himself dispensing their secret virtue! It savours of the dulness with which numbers came

¹ “Cur nullas Aras habent? Templa nulla?” — *The Heathen Objector to Christianity in M. Minucius Felix's Octavius.*

² Mark iii. 1.

to the Immanuel to be healed or to be fed, and yet failed to recognise “the Lord that healeth,”¹ and Him who provided their fathers with manna in the desert.

Is this apathy increased, or is it diminished, by the further view which that same truth carries along with it—that we are *individually* portions of this sacred edifice—“lively stones,” as St. Peter expresses it²? I fear it is increased. We could be content to visit, at stated periods, a shrine or a holy person;—once or twice in our lives, to make a toilsome pilgrimage to Jerusalem or Mecca, and, for the occasion, to put any restraint on our conduct, and to wind up our hearts to any pitch of devotion and holy fear: but to feel that we have not to go to God, but that God has come to us—that He is mysteriously with us, within us, and ever mingling the operations of his spirit with our own government of our will and affections—that, do what we may, whether good or evil, we are with Him, and, whilst we do it, are either going along with Him or resisting Him—that, in every act, and word, and thought, we are either led by the Spirit, or else are grieving the Spirit—to live under the ha-

¹ Exod. xv. 26.

² 1 Peter ii. 5.

bitual sense of this, what is it but to struggle through the narrow path, which he only treads who is “crucified unto this world,” and has “tasted the powers of the world to come?” Far more agreeable is it to the natural man, that we should seek to hide ourselves, as it were, from our heavenly visitant, and to exchange his abiding presence for one that is occasional.

Still, He who has come to make his abode with us, does not, at once, leave us to ourselves. He finds us out, and reveals Himself to us in divers ways. How do we then receive Him? Do we feel that it is indeed the Lord God from whose presence we have been vainly hiding ourselves? Do we recognise the still small voice that asks, Where art thou? Let us, then, come forth trembling, ashamed, and resolved thenceforward to walk humbly with our God. We are yet in time; for the Lord has called us, and him who cometh to Him, He will in no wise cast out. But does any one of us still reply, “Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord.” Alas! for him—a little while, and indeed the Lord will be no more with him; and where his Saviour is, he cannot then come. Or, does he plead with conscience, and allege, that it is impossible habitually to recognise the Divine presence, because he is not sensibly reminded of it? O! let him beware of this

worst delusion. It is not now for the first time, that God has come to his own, and his own have received him not. It has occurred quite as remarkably with those who have had sensible manifestations and ocular proof, as it does now with Christians, who complain of the absence of such evidence. This is never the real cause. We all know, if we have duly inquired, that God is with us; and if he has chosen to assure us of this by any one sufficient method, let us not say, that we neglect the behaviour due to his presence, because it ought, as we suppose, to have been made known to us in some other way. Let us think on those who, amidst a series of miracles wrought, and prophecies fulfilled, yet said to the Immanuel, "We would see a sign from thee."¹

True—we are not assured of the co-operation of the Holy Spirit in the same manner as we are of the operation of our understanding on our affections or passions. We are not conscious of it. But what then? Our condition in this respect, may be, after all, very like the condition of the first followers of our blessed Lord, which we would fain represent to ourselves to be so much more favourable than our own. They believed in Him, they obeyed Him, they loved Him, before they knew that it

¹ Matt. xii. 38.

was God in Christ, who was the object of their regard and veneration. The proof, the sensible manifestation of this, was the reward of a faith exercised in partial blindness. May it not be even so with us? In another life, although no other connexion should be established between God and his Church than now exists, if we should be so far changed as to be made *conscious* of this connexion, what a new and exalted state of being might be the result! The difference between the first and the last stages of apostolic faith and knowledge would be surely but a faint type of this. Nor is the expectation unreasonable. That such a change at least *may* take place, is conceivable, although the precise character of the change be not. One, for instance, who should be born blind, and acquire the use of his eyes after his other senses and faculties had been matured and exercised, would not only perceive objects imperceptible by any senses which he had before employed, but would discover in the objects around him, and most familiar to him, relations which had been hidden from him, and qualities hitherto incomprehensible.¹ In another life the

¹ I have here availed myself of an illustration, furnished by one, to whose valuable suggestions in the course of the inquiry I have been often indebted. See *Scripture Revelations concerning a Future State*, by a Country Pastor, Lect. ix.

controlling influence of the Divine presence on our hearts and conduct may be only in itself the same as now ; and our security from sin, as well as our chief happiness, be made to consist in the exercise of a new or latent faculty by which we shall become cognizant of it. God may not be more intimately present, more with us, than He now is ; and yet, as often as we address him, our hearts may be assured of his presence, and our devotions kindled, by a ray of glory which eye hath not yet seen, only because the eye is not yet framed to perceive it. When exercising that more perfect control on our desires and affections, for which our present life is training us, what if that benignant countenance—that same look of affectionate remonstrance at which the apostle wept and repented—shall be turned on us, to check impulses that now lead to sin, even before an evil thought should be conceived, or actual temptation have commenced ? The present Temple may remain unchanged ; save only, that, by the rending of another veil, we shall see God face to face, and “ shall know even as we also are known.”¹

¹ 1 Cor. xiii. 12.

CHAPTER II.

THE RESEMBLANCES AND THE DIFFERENCES
BETWEEN THE THREE TEMPLES, AND FIRST,
IN RESPECT OF THEIR MATERIALS.

THE expressions “true” and “truth” are used by the writers of the New Testament not only in their ordinary sense, as opposed to what is *false* and *untrue*; but to signify *reality*, or *substance*, as opposed to *types*, *emblems*, *similitudes*. Accordingly, these terms are often applied to Christianity, or to some feature of the Christian scheme, for the purpose of contrasting it with the Jewish dispensation; that being considered as the shadow, and the Christian as the body, or “the truth.” All the rites and ordinances of the Mosaic Law were, we are told, patterns, or images, or symbols, of events and appointments in the Christian covenant; for which, exclusively, this character of truth or reality is claimed. Even the personages of Jewish history are represented as forming a part of this preparatory and promissory system, and to have held office and ministry, the real efficacy of which belonged to the analogous office and

ministry of Christ, the true king,—the true Priest,—and the true Prophet.¹

It is in this sense our Saviour used the word “*truth*,” when in opposition to the prejudices of the unbelieving Jews, who contended for the permanent character and eternal obligation of the Mosaic Law, he told them, “The *truth* shall make you free,”²—meaning that his atonement would *really* release them from the guilt of sin, which the Sacrifices under the Law could not do. It is in this sense, also, St. John used the word, when he wrote—“The *Law* was given by Moses, but grace and *truth* came by Jesus Christ.”³ To the same view we must refer those words of our Lord, “Moses gave you not *the* bread from heaven, but my Father giveth you” (*i. e.* is giving you) “*the true* bread from heaven”⁴—in allusion to the manna, with which God fed the Israelites in the wilderness, and which He thus intimates to have been a type of the spiritual food He was Himself to become to the Church: and those also, “My flesh is meat *indeed*, and my blood is drink indeed”⁵—the literal meaning of the word which

¹ See *e. g.* 1 Cor. x. Heb. viii. ix. x. Rev. xiii. 8.

² John viii. 32.

³ John i. 17.

⁴ John vi. 32.

⁵ John vi. 55.

is rendered *indeed* in our translation being, in both places¹, in “truth.”

This was likewise the meaning of the words “true” and “truth,” in his remarkable declaration to the woman of Samaria, “The hour cometh, and now is, when the *true* worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in *truth*.² The *true* worshippers were so designated in opposition to the typical Church under the old dispensation — the *true* worship, of which the Temple service had been the prelude and preparation, was that, in which God’s attested presence should be attached, neither to a holy mountain, nor to a holy city—neither to Mount Gerizim, nor yet to Jerusalem—in which the Church should be at once the Temple and the worshippers.

By what successive stages the Lord has, as it were, educated the Church for this last and most abstract Revelation of Himself—what are the resemblances and the differences between his three Temples, which we recognise as such by one common symbol being annexed to their dedication, and a common language applied to them by inspiration — in what respects the gradual change thus made in God’s Revelation of Himself

¹ ἀληθῶς.

² John iv. 23.

has been accommodated to the slowly-opening capacity of his Church—to the prejudices, the corruptions, and the weakness of his worshippers—these will be now the objects of inquiry.

This comparative survey will be arranged under the following heads. I. The materials of the three Temples. II. The Divine indwelling. III. Their Services. IV. The persons officiating. V. Their duration. First then let us compare the three Temples in respect of their Materials.

That the Temple of stone was ordained in condescension to the weakness and prejudices of God's first worshippers, will be evident, if we consider what were the character and condition of the Israelites, at the time of its building. They were even then so imperfectly cured of idolatrous practices, as to be continually incurring Divine chastisements on that account. Obstinate so blind as this is unaccountable, except on the supposition that their notion of the distinct nature of God was still very faint and confused, and such as must have perpetually yielded to the influence of bad example and habitual hereditary corruption.

All the nations around were worshipping, each its own deities, attached to a people, a district,

-a mountain, or a grove. There were gods of the hills, and gods of the valleys.¹ The Egyptians had theirs, the Canaanites had theirs; every region, and every city, and almost every family of the heathen world, had its own god. Could the Israelites have been exempt from the influence of the world's example in this respect? We know that they were not. The Israelite in Egypt had been a bondsman in spirit as well as in body, and he continued to wear the chain that fettered his heart and intellect, long after he had shaken off external servitude. It was, apparently, in tenderness to their weakness, that God's first Revelation of Himself to them was as a tutelary deity—as *their* God, the God of their fathers, the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob. Nor was it until a sufficient interval had elapsed, that He formally and explicitly declared Himself to be the God of all the earth likewise.²

It is true, that before the building of Solomon's Temple, many must have been more enlightened than to be included in this description; still, the

¹ See 1 Kings xx. 23 and 28. So Eteocles, in the Phœnissæ, is made to address Polynices, Μυκήνας, μηνθαδίνάκαλει θεούς. Phœniss. 67.

² Compare Exodus vi. 7, with xix. 5.

ready relapse of monarch and people, priesthood and laity, into gross idolatry—and this in periods long subsequent—shows how unfit they were generally for any Revelation of the Divine presence and communion but such as should be attached to *a place*. Possibly any other would, as yet, have been incomprehensible. The Templo of stone was an accommodation to this their spiritual childhood. Because the king dwelt in a house of cedar, it seemed unfitting that the ark of God, which had been honoured with the sign of his presence, should dwell within curtains.¹ All the circumstances of an earthly and local theocracy were demanded, and in compassion to their weakness they were granted.

Let us, for a moment, contrast the frame of mind which all this supposes in the Israelites, with the exercise of faith, necessary to embrace the doctrine of God's presence and intercourse by his Spirit—his present indwelling in the hearts of the faithful—and it is impossible not to admit that this last revelation would have been amazing and inconceivable to the worshippers in the first Temple. Scarcely could they be brought, by a series of severe national judgments up to the

¹ 2 Sam. vii. 2.

period of the Babylonish captivity, to adhere even to the earliest improvement on their original corrupt views, and to worship without any sensible image to represent the object of worship. To have attempted, in the first instance, to impress them with the idea of a Divine residence amongst them, in which there should be no local object at all—no fixed habitation to mark the Divine presence and communications—this would have been surely unavailing. It was only when they had entirely cast off their hereditary habits of idolatry, and had been thoroughly cured of image-worship, that they were fit for being taught to worship Jehovah, “neither in Mount Gerizim, nor yet at Jerusalem, but in spirit and in truth.”

And yet, so abrupt would have been the transition of thought, from the contemplation of God’s presence, as it was manifested in the Temple of stone, to the indwelling of the Holy Spirit within our hearts, that some intermediate stage was requisite for the mind to pause and rest on in the immense transfer of its conceptions. That stage was the Immanuel—God dwelling, not in a house or tabernacle, but in the mysterious abode of a human Being—united with the human heart and mind, as well as with the human body. There was just so much of locality about the material

part of Christ's human nature, as to convey men's views, by an easy transition, to that last mode of residence, which was to be divested of all local associations—that kingdom, in which we are appointed to walk by faith, and not by sight—that Temple, in which the worshippers now worship in spirit and in truth.

There is another aspect under which the difference of materials in the three Temples may be surveyed—one associated not so much with the weakness of man, as with the wisdom of God—with the progressive scheme of salvation, which, even in our imperfect view of it, has been plainly best accomplished in its several stages, by precisely such a kind of Divine manifestation as was attached to each.

In order to estimate the importance of this difference, we must bear in mind, that the Mosaic dispensation was *partial*, the Christian *universal*. The old Church of God was, not accidentally, but designedly and by positive institution, limited to one elected people and one place. Its first institution was based on a principle of preference, election, and separation ; and its partial extent and exclusive character were further preserved, by a strict command to celebrate the appointed means of grace in the Temple only ; and so frequently, as

to render it impossible for distant strangers to be in habitual and full communion.¹ Into the object of this limitation I am not now inquiring; but such was the case.

The Christian dispensation, on the contrary, began with the avowed design of embracing all mankind. The commission of the Apostles was “to baptize and make disciples of *all nations*.² The commandment was that “*all men everywhere* should repent.”³

It is obvious, then, how fit, how essential it was, that there should be a Temple of stone for the partial dispensation; the presence of God in Christ for the transition state, when it was yet partial, but preparing to be extended; and for this last dispensation, which was to embrace all the world, what Temple would have been sufficient, but a Temple co-extensive and identical with the worshippers themselves? As in the true atonement, there was no victim worthy of the priest, no priest worthy of the victim, but He who combined both in his own person; so in the true worship, there could have been no adequate Temple, unless the worshippers and the Temple had been the same.

¹ See Exod. xxxiv. 23; Deut. xii.

² Matt. xxviii. 19; Mark xvi. 15. ³ Acts xvii. 30.

Let us, for a moment, imagine it otherwise. Suppose, that, in order to enjoy the benefits which we now derive from God's spiritual presence amongst us as a Church, the Christian world were obliged to resort, once even in a year, to some appointed place where God had fixed his name. Suppose it Jerusalem, suppose it Rome, suppose it where you will, and you create an insurmountable obstacle to the universality of the Christian religion. As soon as the work of conversion extended beyond the limits of the country where the Shechinah rested, the impossibility of a general conformity must have been felt. But when a distance of half the globe intervened, a few occasional pilgrimages could have been the only mode of compliance with the bond of the covenant; and even these would have been limited to the robust and the wealthy.¹ If again the possibility of removing all these impediments were granted, the very removal of them would suggest a stronger case of impracticability. A Temple must have been provided, whose courts should be so spacious as to contain all the families of the Christian world.

¹ Mahomet felt this difficulty when he ordered his disciples to repair to Mecca *once in their lives.*

In a less degree, but only in a less degree, the residence of the Saviour in the flesh amongst us would have been inconsistent with the enlargement of his train of disciples into a fraternity which comprehends some of all the portions of civilized mankind. He must have continued to be the source of all ecclesiastical authority at least—all reference and appeal on religious questions must have been finally made to Him—and how could this have been done, in the case of Churches located in distant quarters of the globe, and varying in circumstances as much as in distance? I say nothing of the disturbance of society arising out of casual journeys to the seat of spiritual empire; or of the throng which must have been for ever pressing on Him, not, as heretofore, from the small district of Palestine, but from all the kingdoms of the world.

All this, and much more, that renders our Saviour's fleshly residence amongst us inconsistent with our present established state of probation, is overlooked by those interpreters of prophecy, according to whom the Millennium is thus to be realized. From the Anabaptists of the Reformation to the less-alarming speculators of the present day, no prospect has been more attractive to the imagination than this; and yet it

implies a change of condition in the Christian world, which is at variance, it would seem, with the very essentials of God's final dispensation for man on earth. As soon as the Church of Christ began to increase and spread, it became expedient that He should go away. For a train of disciples, which was to reach from one end of the earth to the other, and to occupy a range of countries and communities differing in all ways, in their political institutions and domestic habits, there could be no visible Lord and Master—supposing of course Christianity to be otherwise uncorrupted and unchanged. It was expedient for the universal establishment of God's Church throughout the world that the Temple of stone should be destroyed—it was expedient that the Immanuel even should go away. To direct our contemplations and hopes now to a re-establishment of some sacred centre of Religion, such as that of his once holy city, or to the reign of Christ in the flesh amongst his Church militant here on earth, what is it but to go back, if not to "the beggarly elements" of the Law,¹ certainly, to a stage in God's progressive dispensations, which we have long since passed?

¹ Gal. iv. 9.

And if this be so, what shall we say of the claims of a mere human Being to that earthly throne, which it was expedient for us that even Christ should leave vacant? If it be a fond enthusiasm to mourn for the Immanuel's departure, or to expect his return to govern us in our period of warfare and probation, it is a weakness, which may be pardoned—it is a weakness which saints, which apostles, for a time, felt. But for man to rebuild the throne which God has pronounced inexpedient—to take his seat thereon—and to exercise that universal spiritual dominion, which could have been attached only to the Immanuel's throne—this is indeed “to oppose and exalt himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God sitteth in the Temple of God, showing himself that he is God.”¹

There is yet another point of view, in which, as in the preceding, we discover the fitness of the materials of the three Temples for the several stages of Revelation to which they respectively belong. In this again, both the visionary speculations respecting the Millennium, and the claims of the Romish Church, and the Romish Bishop, will be found to be inconsistent

¹ 2 Thess. ii. 4.

with the very essentials of the last dispensation of God—the dispensation of the Holy Spirit. In other words, they both imply a relapse into a stage in the progressive dispensations, which has been long past and superseded.

Under the Mosaic covenant, the Church was not only confined and partial; but conveyed its privileges to those who participated in them, very unequally. The mere believer in the one true God was considered as possessing a claim, superior indeed to the idolater, but much inferior to the proselyte to Judaism. There was a distinction between the parts of the Temple to which these two kinds of strangers were admitted: and from their respective places there, the one was called the proselyte of the gate, the other the proselyte of righteousness. Again, the lineal descendant of Abraham—the Hebrew of Hebrews—considered himself heir to promises, which set him higher than the most perfect proselyte. Nor did the system of gradations end here. From the first institution of the Mosaic Church, the principle of inequality was laid down in the division of the Israelites themselves into the class which the Levites composed, and those who were not, like them, to exercise certain sacred functions. The very Levites, again, were marked by a strong line of

separation ; and the family of Aaron reserved for the priesthood and its attendant privileges.

In God's new dispensation, on the contrary, there were to be no corresponding distinctions—there were to be no degrees of Christianity. Once a Christian, whether previously a Jew, a proselyte, or a heathen, the churchman was to claim and to enjoy the highest privileges of the covenant. In the new Temple there was to be no family like Aaron's ; no tribe like Levi's ; no nation like the Israelites. Christ “our peace made Jew and Gentile one, having broken down the middle wall of partition between them.”¹

It is this that is emphatically called by St. Paul, “unity of the Spirit,”²—that is, the unity, singleness, or oneness of faith and of privileges, which, in opposition to the gradations of the former dispensation, characterizes that Church in which God's Holy Spirit presides and rules.

But how could this characteristic have been preserved, had either of the former Temples been made the permanent one ? In the case of the Temple of stone, the impediments are as obvious as those which made it inconsistent with the universality of the Christian dispensation. That

¹ Eph. ii. 14.

² ἐνότης τοῦ Πνεύματος. Eph. iv. 3.

all men every where should *equally* enjoy the privileges of the Christian covenant, it was expedient that God should be worshipped, neither on Mount Gerizim, nor yet at Jerusalem, but in spirit and in truth. And equally inconsistent and inexpedient would have been the abiding presence of Christ in the flesh. Those removed by distance from his personal intercourse, could not have been considered as having the privileges of communion *in an equal degree* with his immediate followers. There would not have been *equally* for all “One Lord,” however there might have been “one faith and one baptism.”

It appears, then, that our present trust in the Divine presence, communion, and assistance, (marked as that presence is by no sign, and attached to no place,) is a frame of mind, for which the Church of God had been in gradual training, from the delivery of the Law on Mount Sinai, to the effusion of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost. First was removed the prejudice which connected the one true object of worship with a sensible representation. And this was done, not by addressing to the mind an idea altogether spiritual, but by permanently establishing that symbol, which, beyond all others that could have been devised, was farthest removed from solid substance

and distinct form—a holy Light. Still, for a time, it was necessary to attach this evanescent and unsubstantial emblem to a Temple of stone; until the Church was prepared for a purer and more spiritual view to be exhibited in the Incarnation. The display of that mysterious union of the Divine nature, not merely with the body but with the heart and intellect of a man, was itself the prelude and preparation for a view of the Divine presence and intercourse, in which we cannot point to any one place, or to any one human Being, as the residence of the Godhead. The sacred language is, not “ye are the Temples,” but “ye are the *Temple* of the Holy Ghost”—the Temple, collectively, and “lively stones” individually. We, at last, worship God in spirit and in truth.

Worthy notions indeed of his presence, we cannot presume that we have even yet acquired. We are now, doubtless, only in training for that further stage of Divine communion, which is described in Scripture as seeing God “face to face,” and knowing Him even as we are known by Him.¹ Nay, do we always take care to render our present views of Him even as pure and spiritual as

¹ 1 Cor. xiii. 12.

we may? We have learnt that He is omnipresent—we should bear in mind therefore, that the diffusion of the Shechinah through the Temple of stone, its descent on the Immanuel, and lastly on the Church, were only *symbols*, to attest God's presence and intercourse; and that He could not have *been* more present then, than He was before, or has been since. Or rather, in acknowledging his omnipresence, we must be careful not to allow our mind to dwell on the idea of God's presence, as if it were the same in kind, and only different in degree, from what we mean by the presence of any created object. God's omnipresence means not, strictly speaking, that He is present to all things and all men; but that all things and all men are present to Him. As far as regards his being present to us, He is, correctly speaking, nowhere. His existence cannot reverently be supposed to require the accident of locality. We say indeed, conformably with Scriptural language, that He dwells in heaven. But where and what is heaven? Not surely a *place*—not an abode which can be described by the lines of the astronomer or the geographer. The expression is figurative, involving a negation of all the circumstances of an earthly residence, and especially of the limitation of space. It is still the

infirmity and want of capacity in man, as he now is, that is consulted by the all-merciful Revealer of Himself; and, even in this last stage of his Revelation, we must adopt the spirit of that humble confession which Solomon made when he dedicated the Temple of stone, “The heaven and heaven of heavens cannot *contain* Thee; how much less this house that I have builded?”¹

CHAPTER III.

THE RESEMBLANCES AND THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE THREE TEMPLES, IN RESPECT OF THE DIVINE INDWELLING.

WE have now ascertained what the three successive Temples were; and have recognised them as such by one common symbol being annexed to their dedication, and a common language applied to them by inspiration. We have also pursued the inquiry, next proposed, into the resemblances and the differences between them, as far as relates to the materials of which they were composed—the structure of stone—the human nature of Christ—and the Christian congregation or Church.

¹ 1 Kings viii. 27.

If, after this external survey, we venture to look within, and, so far as we are permitted, and may do it reverently, endeavour to ascertain, how one Temple resembled or differed from another, in respect of the Divine indwelling, we perceive, at once, an important difference between the first Temple, on the one hand, and the second and third, on the other. The sanctity that guarded the Temple of stone from profane use and profane intrusion was *attached* to it, not *intrinsic* and *inherent* in it. Its nature was not changed or operated on by the holy presence. Its worshippers had access to the Lord through its courts, and the Lord communicated with them from its Holy of Holies; but the Temple itself had no participation in that communion and communication. It was the channel of intercourse between God and Man, and no more. It was an instrument of Divine agency, not an object of it. When sentence was executed on it, and of those massive stones, on which its worshippers once gazed with fond admiration, not one was left upon another, the relics that strewed the earth had received no sacred impress to be retained or to be lost.

In all these points the Immanuel and the Church exhibit a striking contrast to the Temple of stone. It is owing to the prominence of this

difference, indeed, that many are led to suppose the Scriptural title of Temples applicable to them only figuratively. What is essential to a Temple, however, belongs to them as to their prototype. They also were the abodes of the Divine presence, and the channels of Divine communion and communication between God and Man. They were not the less Temples, that they were Temples, and something more—that the sanctity they derived from the indwelling of God was not attached to them, but communicated to their nature, intrinsically and inherently—that they were, not only the instruments of the Divine agency, but the objects of it—that God spake, not only through them, but to them, and they partook of the communion of which they were the appointed medium — nor, lastly, that, unlike the Temple of stone, the effects of the Divine indwelling on them are enduring and eternal. The Immanuel was laid in the grave, but rose from it, the same abode of God as before his death. The living stones of God's present Temple, the Church, decay and mingle with the earth ; but we know that they, too, will partake of the power of his resurrection, and rise to partake of a more glorious Divine presence than that which now sanctifies the Temple of the Holy Ghost.

Great is our privilege in not only having,

but being ourselves portions of, a Temple, which we may thus associate with the Immanuel, and take common ground for both in the contrast which we have been tracing between them and God's earliest Temple. Let us not, however, think more highly of ourselves, on this account, than we ought to think. Even in respect of that common ground, vast is the disparity between the Immanuel and us, individually, and as a church. We are not, as He was, *individually* the Temple of God; but only *collectively*. "God gave the Spirit to Him, not by measure," and "in Him dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily;" He was perfect God and perfect man; and this is not the condition either of the Church or of any of its members.

At the same time, a caution of an opposite tendency may be necessary, too; not to suppose, namely, that the Divine indwelling in Christ is so wholly dissimilar from that in his Church, as to make Him, in respect of it, no example to us; which He would not be, if we were not, like Him, supported by the Divine presence, guided by it, and comforted by it. The record of his life—his temptations and his sufferings—would then be a picture which we might admire indeed, but hardly presume to copy. It is true, that

to us the Holy Spirit is given *by measure*; still that measure is a measure of grace sufficient for *us*. It is true, that it is given in a way, which does not render the Christian, as his Lord is, both God and man: but still, the moulding of our nature into the highest perfection of which it is capable, is one promised result of that participation; and to this we may hope to attain, if “that mind be in us which was also in Christ Jesus,”¹ who “suffered for us, leaving us an example, that we should follow his steps.”

Looking still *within* the Three Temples, and contemplating still the agency and operation of the Divine indwelling in them, we may perceive another feature of comparison between them, in respect of which, they all differ from one another. As the channels of Divine Revelation and communication, each has had its own distinct form of Oracle; if I may so speak.

In the first Temple this was a voice, it is supposed, which proceeded from between the cherubims.² During the continuance of the

¹ Phil. ii. 5.

² See Exod. xxv. 22; Numbers vii. 89; Psalm lxxx. 1; 2 Kings xix. 15; Isaiah xxxvii. 16. The traditional account of a revelation by the Urim and Thummim on the breastplate of the High Priest is very doubtful. It probably had its origin in the circumstance of his being bound to wear

Temple of stone, however, the Lord frequently varied this mode of making known his will, by raising up prophets especially commissioned to declare it; and as the period approached when the Shechinah¹ was to be wholly withdrawn, we find the number and importance of the Revelations of those human oracles proportionably great. By this means, from the period of the establishment of the first Temple Oracle, to the close of prophecy, there was a gradual departure from the original mode of Divine communication, as if to smooth the way to the second method, for which that had been preparatory.²

this ornament when consulting the oracle, the twelve precious stones on it designating the twelve tribes whose representative he then was. See Graves on the *Pentateuch*, note to part II. lect. 5, which contains reference to the opinions of Lowman, Spencer, and Witsius.

¹ This holy manifestation appears to have ceased with the destruction of Solomon's Temple, which took place A. C. 588. See Prideaux's *Connexion*, part i. book iii.; Lightfoot on the *Temple*, ch. xv. sect. 4; and Calmet's *Dictionary*, Shechinah. By the absence of this then from the subsequent building, Haggai's prophecy, that "the glory of the latter house should be greater than of the former," is fixed in its application to the appearance of Christ as "God manifest in the flesh. See Haggai ii. 9.

² The Jewish account of the Bath Kol, (*daughter of the Voice,*) by which it is pretended that occasional revelations were made, subsequent to the cessation of prophecy, is al-

That mode of communication was, the oral instruction of the Immanuel. His words became equivalent to the mysterious intimation from the cherubim; to the voice or vision which instructed the prophets; and to that more awful Voice which dictated the Law from Mount Sinai, when as yet there was neither Temple nor Tabernacle.

Lastly, to the Voice or Word of God in the Jewish dispensation, and to the words of Christ in the second Temple, corresponds the Christian Record in the Temple of the Holy Ghost. It is true, that during the apostolic age—the age of inspiration—the analogy was not between the Bible and the former modes of communication; but between those modes, and the gifts and endowments of the Spirit. But nevertheless, it is the Christian *Record*; and not the many forms of *Inspiration*, that constitutes the proper oracular appendage of the last Temple. The apostolic period embraced only the *erection* of the holy edifice; and, as the apostles were removed one by one, the Temple rose, was completed, and was left to its present previsions. The apostolic age

together unworthy of credit. See Lightfoot's *Harmony of the Evangelists*, Matt. iii. 17. Prideaux supposes it to have been a mode of divination like the *Sortes Virgilianæ*. See *Connexion, &c.* part ii. book 5.

may be compared to the giving of the old Law from Mount Sinai. That preceded the building of the Tabernacle and Temple, the appointment of the mystic holy of holies, and the supplementary inspiration of the prophets; that too was a period more dazzling and awaking than the permanent state to which it led. Even so, the apostolic delivery of the Christian Law was more glorious than the provisions for its permanency; but it was a display of glory which was to be done away. God was not to continue to speak in the same manner, and with the same circumstances, as in the first promulgation of the Gospel Law. Appropriated to his third Temple—preserved within his sanctuary, the Church—there was to be an abiding oracle. The Bible was appointed to be the permanent channel of Divine communication. It rests its claims to be so considered, on the same strong grounds which supported the authority of those oracles of God which it has succeeded; and demands from us the same implicit assent and obedience—like them, the mode of delivery has been made miraculous. Nor is any difference of authority implied in the difference that exists between them in this respect—that the earlier oracles, namely, were intermit-

tent, and renewed, as occasion called for them ; whilst ours were given once for all, are perpetual, and so constituted as to serve all occasions. The fitness of this very peculiarity about the Christian Record, no less than of those points which characterise respectively the Jewish oracle, and the teaching of Christ, will be very apparent from the following obvious considerations.

In the first place, the whole system of God's dealings with his elder Church, was accommodated (as I have already had occasion to point out) to a far less advanced condition spiritual, moral, and intellectual than ours. He addressed them and governed them, in comparison with us, as children. He taught them by specific *rules* ; to us He holds out motives, and, for our guidance, provides *general principles*. In accordance with this view, He gave them oracles that defined the particular cases to which they were applicable, and dictated to the Church almost its daily duty, with such tender allowance for its weak capacity, and its inaptitude for higher views and a larger responsibility, as is shown by the parent or teacher to the child. Trained by this gradual guidance and instruction, the Church has been at length released from its school-master the Law—its education is completed ; and it is

sent forth to act on the principles of the Gospel, enforced by motives more high and heavenly. These principles and these persuasives are the substance of the Christian Scriptures.¹ Not requiring to be continually given, like the specific commands to the Jews, they have been there permanently fixed; and being permanently fixed, it was only necessary once for all to declare their authority by miracles. A recurrence of Revelation requires a renewal of miracles; but the

¹ It may perhaps be necessary to point out, that I am not, by this expression, excluding the Old Testament from the Christian rule of faith. By the Gospel-fulfilment of the Law and the Prophets, the Old Testament volume becomes part of the *Christian* Scriptures. What was shadowy and elementary knowledge to the Israelites, has been converted by that event into solid and perfect knowledge for the Christian. The whole character of the book has been changed. To us its prophecies assume the form of miraculous history, and to us its historical records discover the purport of God's mysterious dealings with his people, and the end to which the series of events led; whereas to their eye all this was dark and perplexed—the veil of which St. Paul speaks, 2 Cor. iii. 14, was yet “untaken away.” Its moral and religious precepts, again, have undergone a change, which may be compared to that of compound substances submitted to some powerful test, which separates the various ingredients—the fixed from the volatile—and exhibits the more valuable in their unmixed purity. The Gospel has *analysed*, as it were, the Law, and enables us to separate from the dross of peculiar, temporary, and local ordinances and precepts, the eternal commands of God.



volume of the book once closed, miracles are no longer needed.

Whilst the conformity of the oracular vehicle to the character of the first and last Temples respectively is thus beautifully exact, it is no less interesting to reflect on the place occupied by the teaching of the Immanuel—the oracle appended to the second Temple—and the very appropriate form of communication which was so provided for the period of transition from the first to the third.

Our Lord, whilst He was accomplishing the scheme of man's redemption, was also training his followers for the knowledge of what He was doing. His lessons, however, contrasted with those of Divine inspiration (as it appears on the pages of the apostolic writings), were not properly *explanations* of the scheme, but *statements* accompanying the things done, which statements were left by Him to be afterwards explained. They were, in this respect, like the heads of a lecture, which a professor first puts into the hands of his pupils, and afterwards fills up by word of mouth. Without the after comment and explanation, the lecturer's synopsis would be imperfect, and in many parts unintelligible; although the synopsis is highly useful in preparing the class for his

lectures, and afterwards in recalling to their memory the train of instruction hinged on it. Like this class-paper, then, our Lord's teaching contained hints and expressions, which, little comprehended at the time, it was the office of the Holy Spirit to recall to the minds of the inspired, and to point out all to which these hints were intended to lead—"to guide them into all truth."¹ In conning over the scheme of Christianity, as presented to them in the parables and discourses of Christ, one disciple would probably anticipate with more readiness than another the filling up of the many heads which his instruction embraced; but to all, until the day of Pentecost, that instruction was only an outline; and if the whole of Christianity was stated, and enunciated, no part was fully developed.

The advantage of such a transition-stage between the very different modes of instruction in God's will, which the Christian and the Jewish oracles exhibit, is obvious. But how could that have been so well effected as by attaching the oracle of *enunciation* (if I may be permitted so to describe our Lord's teaching) to the person of an Immanuel; one whose character and life should

¹ John xvi. 13.

awaken such a lively interest in each brief announcement that was made, as to fix the lesson indelibly on the mind, and to keep it there ready for the enlightening of God's Spirit. His lessons were not addressed to the understanding alone, but to the heart, with all its human sympathies and moral associations awake; they were engrafted on passing occurrences and present scenes of lively, intense, and often painful interest; and the minute impression produced thereby was precisely such as the character of his teaching required. When *e. g.* standing in the Temple, He told the Jews mysteriously and solemnly, "Destroy this Temple, and in three days I will raise it up;"¹ the declaration so made must have been imprinted, to the letter, on the minds of his disciples. It was from God (they might have argued), for no man could do those things that He undertook to do unless God were with him. But, added to the awful sanctity of a Divine message, there was an awakening of personal feelings towards Him as a man—as their friend, their Master, their future King. The remark took root, and entwined itself amidst many clinging associations, which had connected the Messiah's

¹ John ii. 19.

glory with the glory of that edifice, whose ruin his words mysteriously implied. All this served the needful purpose of fixing the unexplained lesson on their memory, until the Comforter, who was to teach them all things, should explain it.

Another, and not the least important, aspect, under which we may contemplate the several changes in the appointed media of Divine communication, is their adaptation to the numbers for whose use the several oracles were respectively intended. A voice speaking from between the cherubim, was the most convenient for being consulted in the guidance of a single church and people; the words of Jesus sufficed, and were best, for his immediate followers; whilst for that dispensation, in which the Church was to acknowledge no limits but the boundaries of earth, no period but the end of time, there was need of a voice which should go forth into all lands, and its sounds unto the end of the earth. The Bible is the only form of Divine oracle, which could have been unvarying, and universally accessible.

The view which has been now claimed for the Scriptures, supposes a certain estimate of their inspiration. The Bible is the present vehicle of God's oracles. This does not mean, however, that its every word is of the nature of an inspired

oracle, or even its matter, when it involves no religious teaching. To contend for this would be much as if the disciples of Jesus had contended for every word which fell from his lips, on whatever subject, being part of the instruction from God to man, and had applied it accordingly. As in Himself (if such an illustration may be used), what is of God is mixed with much that is purely human ; and to confound and level the two is unwise, unwarranted, and irreverent. On the other hand, whatever in it is religious teaching, it is the Lord Himself who is instructing us. The Bible, in short, is not always and throughout occupied with the Divine message ; but, whenever the relations between God and man, the dealings of God with man, or the will of God respecting man, are the subject, then, as if the Immanuel were still speaking, whatever it declares, records, or commands, it is, “as the voice of the Almighty God when He speaketh.”¹

¹ Ezekiel x. 5.

CHAPTER IV.

THE RESEMBLANCES AND THE DIFFERENCES BE-TWEEN THE THREE TEMPLES, IN RESPECT OF THEIR SERVICES.

ALL conformity to the will of God is, properly speaking, religious service, whether the obligation be made known to us by a law of our nature, or by an extraordinary revelation; for, the obligation rests ultimately, in both cases alike, on the supreme authority of our Almighty Lord. But, by religious service, we ordinarily understand, not those duties which natural conscience enjoins, but those which have been prescribed by a miraculous revelation; and not only so, but prescribed for us as attached to the Temple of God—as members of his Church or Kingdom on earth. Having compared the Three Temples in respect of, first, their materials, and next, of the Divine indwelling, we will now compare them in respect of their Services. To begin with that of the first Temple.

It consisted of numerous ceremonies, many of them apparently trifling, but all enjoined with extreme and scrupulous minuteness of detail. It was moreover strictly and altogether a *histrionic* ser-

vice—a service not of words, but of action. For, although prayer by word of mouth was, probably, always practised individually among the Israelites, and unquestionably for the greater part of their existence as God's people; yet it appears to have made no part of the Levitical ordinance—to have been no portion of the regular Temple-service. The exceptions which are recorded, such as Solomon's prayer at the dedication of the Temple, are so manifestly special and extraordinary, as rather to strengthen the conclusion to which we are unavoidably led, by the omission of all command to pray, in a code of directions so minute as the Levitical.

Several circumstances in the condition of the Israelites made this particular kind of service appropriate for their Temple; and without a due consideration of these circumstances, we may be liable to form an erroneous and unworthy idea of God's appointments for his chosen people. So contemplated, however, the Jewish ritual not merely exhibits marks of that wisdom and far-looking design, of which a highly gifted man may be supposed capable, but was so marvellously adapted to events then buried deep in futurity, as to make it inconceivable that it should have been the result of human wisdom and foresight.

The pervading principle of the first Temple-service was, that it was *typical* and *prophetic*. Its sacrifices, its purifications, its offerings, all its solemnities, constituted a perpetual volume of *prophecy expressed by signs*, in which, the atonement of Christ, the sanctification of his Spirit, and all the leading features of the Gospel, were prefigured. To the Jews themselves it no more conveyed this meaning, indeed, than did their more obscure prophetic Scriptures. Their Temple service was to them, in this respect, like a task which a child has learnt by rote, without being required, or being able, to comprehend its import. The Law was their schoolmaster; and it was their duty and their service to submit to its teaching, whether they could or could not understand the purpose for which the lesson was enjoined.

But was this lesson, this service, reasonable? Was it necessary that prophecy should be so embodied, and imposed in so cumbrous and burthen-some a form, in order to be handed down from age to age, by persons, too, who were incapable, generally, at least, of deriving from it any of the comfort and hope which its hidden meaning could impart only by being understood—any satisfaction beyond the sense of doing blindly, although

humbly and confidingly, the will of God? The object *was* of the last importance. “The Law was their schoolmaster to *bring them unto Christ.*”¹ Nothing less than this toilsome training of generation after generation would seem likely to have been effectual for giving that bent to the national mind—those habitual religious views—which should prepare the appointed future generation for recognising their Messiah, and embracing the Christian doctrines thus made beforehand familiar and congenial. Scarcely indeed, with all this preparatory discipline, were any found, at the allotted season, ready for the fulfilment of the types. Without any such provision, what reception would the Gospel have met with?

It may be said, indeed, that the Gospel *was*, after no great interval, proclaimed to the Gentiles also; and that the obstacles to its reception among them were not much, if at all, greater than those which barred its access to the Jews. If it was foolishness to the Gentiles, who had not gone through this training of generation after generation, it became also a stumbling-block to the Jews. We should recollect, however, that the dispersion of the Jews through the Gentile

¹ Gal. iii. 24, 25.

world was the very means by which Christianity was first introduced to the heathen. The apostle Paul appears invariably to have preached, in the first instance, in the synagogues.¹ Through the conversion of the Jews, partial though it was, the spiritual conquest of their Gentile brethren was effected. The important point to be considered, however, is not the actual result which the training of the Levitical service produced on the Jews; but the result which *it was calculated to produce*. It is by this, and not by the abuse or the neglect of the Divine provision, that that provision must be estimated. It was designed to prepare the Jews for the Messiah and his revelation; and was not the less adapted for this end,

¹ See the account of Paul and Barnabas's ministry in Cyprus (Acts xiii. 4); at Antioch in Pisidia, v. 14; and, more especially the latter part of the chapter from v. 42. At Iconium, the next stage of their journey, the synagogue is still the place where they preach, notwithstanding their late ill usage, and Paul's bold declaration. Acts xiv. 1.

So, again, in Paul's second journey, we find him, at Philippi, preaching "on the sabbath at the river side, where prayer was wont to be made" (xvi. 13); and at Thessalonica, we are expressly told that "there was a synagogue of the Jews, and Paul, *as his manner was*, went in unto them, and three sabbath days reasoned with them out of the Scriptures," xvii. 1, 2. The like notices occur of his ministry at Athens, at Corinth, and at Ephesus.

because the Jews did not generally and completely avail themselves of it.

To understand fully, however, the fitness of the first Temple-service—the grounds which rendered such a typical and prophetic form of worship needful, and especially for the Israelites—we must bear in mind the rude condition of that people, both in a moral and in an intellectual point of view, at the time this service was ordained for them. Of all periods in the history of mankind, the present age is perhaps the least suitable for duly estimating the use of a histrionic service, which the poverty of their moral and intellectual capacity made necessary. The great mass of the people were, possibly, incapable of having their attention excited, or their hearts elevated to God, by the abstract thinking which the employment of language, for such a purpose, supposes. Men so circumstanced must have their outward senses strongly stimulated, preparatory to the exercise of their understanding.¹

¹ There is much probability in the view which assigns to some of the Mosaic rites another instructive purpose, that of opposition to the idolatrous practices and false creeds of the heathen. See *Witsii Aegyptiaca*. Certainly no method could have been devised more likely to prevent all religious communion between the worshippers of Jehovah and the rest of the world, than to appoint for the former a service which

It scarcely needs to be further pointed out, that if a typical service, comprising obscure prophecies, were necessary, it must have been likewise necessary to have this service described with the most minute exactness ; that the observance of every tittle should be enforced ; and no discretion allowed for deviating from the formula ; for adding, diminishing, or altering. The performance of such a service was like taking a copy of a book in an unknown tongue—we dare not alter word, or letter, or dot ; because we may be destroying the sense in some material point. The service of the Jewish Temple was a holy record, the language and characters of which, few of those who were perpetuating it understood ; and none perfectly enough to make it safe to give them liberty to alter one tittle. It was therefore the command of God that this service should be performed according to the letter of the commandment.

should be revolting to the most sacred prejudices of the latter. Tacitus notices the fact. “ Moses quo sibi in posterum gentem firmaret, novos ritus, *contrariosque ceteris mortalibus* indidit. Profana illic omnia quæ apud nos sacra ; rursus concessa apud illos quæ nobis incesta.”—*Hist. lib. v. c. 4.* “ Lo, shall we sacrifice the abomination of the Egyptians before their eyes, and will they not stone us ? ” was doubtless a feeling which was designed to be strongly impressed on the Israelites.

At the same time, this very restriction would have been impracticable, but for a feature in God's first Church, which has been already the subject of discussion—*its narrow limits*. Precise rules about so intricate a ceremonial would have rendered conformity impossible, in all climates and under all governments, as the Christian Church exists now. The colder regions of the north would have presented an insuperable obstacle to the many ablutions enjoined by it; whilst differences in the government, laws, and national customs of the different states of the world, would, in other instances, have occasioned impediments no less insurmountable. No discretion was left—all exercise of it expressly forbidden; because the limitation of God's kingdom was an essential principle of his dispensation. The more we compare together the several parts of each dispensation, as well as the dispensations themselves, the more clearly we thus perceive a consistency and harmony pervading the whole scheme of salvation. No analogy is worthy of this vast and complex moral system but the system of the material universe; and how much (we may add) that is sublime and astonishing in both, escapes the observation of the careless beholder, from the very circumstance that

the attention is not startled by any jarring and disturbance. In both, the various parts have been adjusted with so delicate a mechanism—the movements are all so easy and imperceptible—that we are apt to forget the mysterious impulse by which the course of the spiritual no less than of the material world glides on from time to eternity, accomplishing, silently though certainly, the vast designs of Almighty wisdom.

The Law being a shadow of good things to come, there is, as might be expected, not only a difference, but a contrast, between the service of the first and third Temples. The Jewish ritual was prophecy, which was now fulfilled; a pledge, which was now redeemed; and the service of the new and last Temple was accordingly framed in reference to a reality that had been exhibited, instead of the representation of that which was only existing in promise. Hence it not only differs from, but is in several respects, (as I have said,) expressly opposed to, the Levitical service.

As to the *form* of this service, the vehicle of expression, the clumsy and cumbrous method by symbol was no more requisite. Higher intellectual endowments were contemplated in the new Israel. The Temple-service was now made verbal; and thereby was established one of the

most important channels of its influence. A Christian habituated to address God altogether in the same way as he communicates with his fellow-creatures, must needs have his prayers influenced by his use of language on other subjects; and his conversation, and indeed all that he utters, influenced by his addresses to God. This is the obvious and natural result, unless there be some powerful impediment to the process of association —such, for instance, as prayers with the lips and not with the heart and understanding; or, if the converse be supposable, the habit of conversing and using language on every other topic without regarding the meaning of what we say, and attending only to one's prayers. Some cultivation of mind too, more, at all events, than the Israelites originally had, is necessary for securing to the worshipper the benefit which I have supposed to be intended by the change of worship—that is, for the ordinary intercourse of men to give increased facility to the communication of their thoughts in prayer to God; and for their conversation with one another to have, not indeed the terms of their addresses to God, but, to some extent, the frame of mind under which they are uttered—that consciousness of the Divine presence, which shall habitually render all inter-

course among Christians, as the intercourse of beings to whom the ear of God is open, not for prayer alone, but for every word, evil or good, idle or seasonable.

It is not, however, merely for the purpose of enforcing a change from the Temple-service of the Jews to our own, that the New Testament contains such earnest injunctions to *pray*, and such solemn assurances of the efficacy of prayer, notwithstanding that our heavenly “Father knoweth what things we have need of, before we ask him.”¹ The foundation of Christianity was laid for a superstructure which did not immediately and at once rise on it. After a time, the wise of this world mingled with the simple and unlearned in seeking for admission into the Church. This new class of converts were persons trained to doubt, to inquire, and to speculate; and this habit of mind, which their philosophy and their learning produced, was not to be confined to their age or particular pursuits and circumstances. No religious duty was so likely to have its *reasonableness* questioned as that of praying, and the importance of no duty is, accordingly, more insisted on in the Gospel. That the omniscient God must know what we

¹ Matth. vi. 8.

need before we ask, was a truth which would be likely to make it seem frivolous and vain to ask. Hence it is, we may presume, that the assertion of that Divine attribute which would seem to make prayer useless, has been connected with the command to pray.¹

In saying that the Christian service is a service of words, I must not be understood to imply that *all* our Temple-service is comprehended in prayer. As was before observed, moral conformity, no less than obedience to ritual precepts, is in an accurate estimate, to be regarded as religious service. Whatever, in short, conscience dictates, is the *natural* service of mankind, performed under an obligation, which the Author of our being thus declares and commands.² The revelation, therefore, of any additional service, supposes this, as the original service to which all other is only an addi-

¹ See Matt. vi. 8, 9.

² That a recognition of this service, and of the obligation to perform it, survived in the heathen world the knowledge of Him who is the object of it, is plain from the occasional avowal of a sentiment so forcibly expressed by Persius.

“Quin damus id superis, de magna quod dare lance
 Non possit magni Messalæ lippa propago,
 Compositum jus, fasque animi, sanctosque recessus
 Mentis, et incocutum generoso pectus honesto?
 Hæc cedo ut admoveam Templis, et farre litabo.”

Satyr. ii. v. 71.

tion. In the case of the Jewish ritual, the addition was, for the reasons assigned, immense, and of a peculiar kind. But, even during the Jewish dispensation, the prophets, as occasional messengers of God, were commissioned to remind the people, that this service was not a substitute for, but a temporary appendage to, that which had been enjoined from the creation, by a law, that was likewise the law of God—the dictate of natural conscience.¹ When, however, the object of all the extraneous ceremonial of Judaism was accomplished, the erection of the new Temple involved no need of additions foreign to the natural service of a holy life. Contrasted with the former, indeed, the Christian service was—to use the words of the apostle—“to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep themselves unspotted from the world.”² The service of the last Temple has been regulated solely by reference to relations between Man created, redeemed, and sanctified, and his Creator, Redeemer, and Sanctifier. All that is new and peculiar to it has arisen out of the revelation of so much of these relations as were new, or before unknown.

Again, as these points were not, like the subjects

¹ See *e. g.* Isaiah i. 14—17.

² James i. 27. The word *θρησκεία* is improperly rendered in our translation “religion”—it should have been “service.”

comprised in the Levitical service, obscure and veiled in futurity; but views so clear that those who ran might read; the old system of minute, unvarying rules, was no longer requisite or suitable. The Christian was fully instructed in the *object* of the service required of him; and provided with *principles* to which he was to conform, according to the diversities of age, climate, or country.

In noticing this feature of contrast, I cannot omit to observe, that the very opposite system to that which has been made an argument for the Divine legation of Moses, becomes an argument now for the Divine legation of the apostles and their inspired coadjutors. That the Israelites should have been bound to the observance of a most minute and circumstantial ceremonial, without any discretionary power to deviate from the least tittle, was a procedure that must be referred to Divine, and not human, wisdom; because the only intelligible account of such a ceremonial is, that it involved obscure prophecy, which would have been exposed to corruption, by permitting the least alteration;—that the founders of the Church should omit to prescribe any form of service at all, can only be explained, by supposing their own natural suggestions to have been restrained by Divine control. It would

have been the natural course for men under any circumstances, who were establishing a religious society, and enjoining a religious service, to have done this; but in the case of Jews, who had been educated in conformity to the minute and literal directions of their Law, there was the force of peculiar habit aiding the common tendency of human nature. And yet no Christian liturgy appears on the pages of the New Testament—no directions about forming one. Was this man's doing, or God's?

The absence, then, first of typical institutions, and next of minute and unchangeable rules, appears to constitute the main peculiarity of the Christian service, as contrasted with the Jewish. It will be recollected, however, that there are two exceptions to this general statement. Two typical ceremonies have been admitted into the service of the Christian Temple—Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord. Their dissimilarity, in this respect, from the general character of that service, deserves an attentive consideration. It may, not unreasonably, be understood to indicate that there is, in the events typified by these two institutions, some distinguishing feature, which has rendered this memorial of them, and of them only, suitable and needful. Now one

difference between such a mode of registering events, and that by words, is, that it is invariable and universal. It addresses itself alike to the apprehension of all ages, and of all people. Record by writing an occurrence, or a precept, in terms ever so definite, still the change of language necessary for conveying it from one people to another, nay the change which time produces even in the original language in which it is deposited, (supposing no corruption of the document to take place,) renders such a record more or less liable to misrepresentation; although it doubtless possesses, in other points of view, great advantages over a symbolical representation. To uncultivated minds moreover, a symbolical rite is more impressive and attractive, and often more intelligible; and it should be recollected, that although the Gospel is adapted and addressed to a more enlightened state of society than was the Law, it recognises, and has provided for, those portions of an enlightened society, which fall short in most, if not in all, Christian countries, of the preparatory capacity for the whole sum of Gospel-truth. Whilst, therefore, to the Christian volume was committed the whole of Gospel-Revelation, it was

doubtless a wise and merciful provision, to select the two most important features of that revelation for the record of type and symbol, as well as of language. The doctrines of Regeneration by the Holy Spirit, and of Atonement by the death of Christ, followed by his spiritual indwelling in us — these form the epitome of Christianity. Extracted from the full record of Revelation, translated, as it were, into symbol and type, and so, engrafted on the Christian service, and made, in an especial manner, means of grace, their eminent importance was thereby signified, and a preservative furnished against our overlooking either the meaning or the importance designed to be attached to the corresponding passages of the sacred volume.

Still, even in the instance of these, we may perceive a deviation from the method of prescribing the symbolical service under the Law. Those portions only of our Christian rites have been made the subject of an unvarying command, which are the main and essential features, and the exact observance of which no differences of age or civilized society can affect;¹ whilst all the

¹ It has been remarked, that *bread* and *wine* are articles in common use among all the civilized world.

service requisite to be appended for the completion of each, has been left to the discretion of the Church, limited only by the principle of adding nothing that is either incongruous to the rites themselves, or otherwise inconsistent with the religion of which they form a part.

In the foregoing remarks, the service of the third Temple has been considered immediately after that of the first; and a comparison instituted between them, which contains no reference to the intermediate Temple—the Immanuel. For the reason of this, the reader's attention must be directed to an important difference between the first and second Temples in respect of their relation to the third. The first Temple and its appendages were, from their very nature, utterly destroyed by the establishment of the Christian Church; whereas the Immanuel was eternally connected with it, and formed its foundation and its corner-stone. To the Temple of God “manifest in the flesh” there was accordingly, in the strictest sense, no peculiar service attached. All that related to a service, was that preparatory training for one, which his followers received; and it is in reference to this that He must have drawn the analogy between their attendance on Him, and

that of the Levitical priests on the Temple of stone.¹ Hence the very striking reply which He made to one who consulted Him about the best method of fulfilling the old service, “This is the work of God, that ye believe in Him whom He hath sent;”² which was as much as to say, “Why ask me about the best method of fulfilling a service, which God is even now abolishing? The only present service is to believe in me—to trust to me, and wait humbly for that which I am preparing my disciples to receive.” Faith in Christ is still, as it was then, the very essence and vital principle of the Christian service; but it was then the *only* service; inasmuch as that to which it led, and with which it is now connected, was not yet given. The period of the intermediate Temple was an interval of anticipation, surmise, and preparatory training. Like Israel waiting at the foot of Mount Sinai, the elect of Christ, without, as yet, discarding the obsolete observances of their fathers, kept their eye anxiously fixed on a mingled scene of light and darkness,

¹ Matt. xii. 5. The text is a very remarkable one. See some observations on it in the note appended to Abp. Whately’s *Essay On the Abolition of the Law*.

² John vi. 29.

from which a new law and a new service were about to issue.

To this view the teaching of the Lord's Prayer is no exception. Our Lord, as well as his followers, recognised and performed no public service but that of the old Temple. Their use of this prayer did not, during his abode with them, correspond to its subsequent use, or make part of any form of worship corresponding to our Church Liturgies; but answered rather to domestic and family prayer. The leader of every sect was then considered in the light of father or head of a family, whose members were almost as intimately connected with him and with one another, as a natural household; and they accordingly joined, as such, in certain common devotional exercises. "Lord, teach us to pray, as John also taught his disciples,"¹ was the request, in compliance with which the Lord's Prayer was given; and it was, on the same principle, contrasted with the long prayers made by the *disciples of the Pharisaic doctors*.² Its transfer to the public service of the Christian

¹ Luke xi. 1.

² Compare Luke v. 33, with Matt. xxiii. 14, and Luke xx. 46.

Church was reasonable, and in nowise inconsistent with its original use; but could only take place when a public Christian service was established.

It is pleasing to trace in this, and in other instances, a manifest desire, on the part of the first Christians, to perpetuate, as far as was possible, the domestic character of that little circle of familiar friends, out of which the Church arose. The feeling was natural in the apostles and other immediate followers of Jesus; but to do this was plainly a fulfilment also of his will. For this very purpose He seems to have accustomed them to regard one another as brethren, and to address one another by that title. In accordance with such a design, apparently, they were taught to evince their union with Him, by love to one another, and to all who should bear his name: “A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another; as I have loved you, that you also love one another. By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another.”¹

I cannot but think, that the Lord’s Prayer, so understood, is more impressive in our present use

¹ John xiii. 34, 35.

of it, and connected with more delightful associations, than if we view it as originally framed in reference to the condition of the Christian world at large. It seems thus, every time we utter it, to carry us back to those holy moments, when a beloved few sat at the feet of Jesus, or joined Him in prayer to the Father ; and reminds us that we are now “the disciples.” “Do this, as oft as ye do it, in remembrance of me,” was the expression of an affectionate wish, for the fulfilment of which, not the Sacrament of his Last Supper alone, but his Prayer likewise, was designed ; for that, too, reminds us of Him personally, bringing Him back to our hearts, as He was when his little family of disciples learned it from his lips, and refreshing our faith, that yet again, He will be seen and heard on earth, and by us.

Nevertheless, when the Son of man cometh, shall He find this faith on the earth ? Will He find us prepared by it to welcome Him, and rejoice in his presence ? Are our homes ready for his reception, our hearts for his sympathy, our lives for his scrutiny ? Are we, in short, so living, that we should, above all things, *like* the Son of man to come and live with us ? Or do our hearts say, what our lips dare not, “Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord ?”

CHAPTER V.

THE RESEMBLANCES AND THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE THREE TEMPLES IN RESPECT OF THE PERSONS OFFICIATING IN THEIR SERVICES.

ALTHOUGH the second Temple has little or no place in the comparison between the services attached to the three Temples, it claims a prominent one in that to which we now proceed—the comparison between the persons appointed to minister in them.

The character of the Jewish priesthood was intimately connected with the prophetic object of their service. The priests were the principal actors in the figurative representation of the Law—it was *the same sacrifices*, which they offered oftentimes.¹ They were, as a Body, and the high priest individually, the type of the true Priest; and in Christ, accordingly, the type was fulfilled, and rendered useless for the future.² It is impossible to state this in any form which shall be more explicit than the original declarations of Scripture. Of the typi-

¹ Heb. x. 11.

² The reader will find this view clearly and ably stated in the fifth of Abp. Whately's *Sermons on several Occasions*.

cal character of the old priesthood, St. Paul, for example, writes thus; “We have such an High Priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the heavens; a minister of the sanctuary and of the *true* tabernacle, which the Lord pitched, and not man.”¹ “There are priests that offer gifts according to the Law; who serve unto *the example and shadow of heavenly things.*”² “Now when these things were thus ordained, the priests went always into the first tabernacle, accomplishing the service of God. But into the second went the high priest alone, once every year, not without blood, which he offered for himself, and for the errors of the people; the Holy Ghost this signifying—that the way into the holiest of all was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing. *Which was a figure, for the time then present,* in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices, that could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience—which stood only in meats and drinks, and divers washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation. But Christ being come an

¹ Heb. viii. 1, 2.² Heb. viii. 5.

High Priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building; neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood He entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us.”¹ Again, as to the appointments under the Law being annulled, because of their typical character, by the coming of that which fulfilled the types, the same apostle in the same place writes, “In that He saith *a new covenant*, He hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth, and waxeth old, is ready to vanish away.”² “He taketh away the first, that He may establish the second.”³

In the second Temple, Christ was the Priest—the Priest, as well as the Temple and the Sacrifice. His sacerdotal office differed, however, from the corresponding office in the Jewish Temple, inasmuch as it was employed about a real and efficacious atonement and sanctification, and He was the real character which the former priesthood had represented. His priesthood differed also from the Levitical, in that *all centered in Him alone*; whereas the

¹ Heb. ix. 6—12.

² Heb. viii. 13.

³ Heb. x. 9.

priests under the law were many, and a succession: their service was, to transmit from one generation to another the personification of a character, which was properly his alone; He, in that character, "trod the wine-press alone."¹ "They truly" (in the apostle's words) "were many priests, because they were not suffered to continue, by reason of death. But this man, because He continueth ever, hath an unchangeable priesthood."²

Another very important feature of contrast is, that they were not exempt from sin; and not being exempt from sin, they offered up their sacrifices for themselves as well as for others; Christ was sinless, and offered up his sacrifice for others, not for Himself. This defect of an essential priestly qualification, in the Levitical priests, although it did not render them unfit for *representing* the character of the Mediator between God and man, yet was incompatible with their *being themselves* truly priests and mediators. "Such an High Priest," writes St. Paul, "became us, who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens. Who needeth not daily, as

¹ Isaiah lxiii. 3.

² Heb. vii. 23, 24.

those high priests, to offer up sacrifice, first, for his own sins, and then for the people's, for this He did once, when He offered up Himself. For the Law maketh men high priests which have infirmity; but the word of the oath, which was since the Law, maketh the Son, who is consecrated for evermore.”¹ “If He were on earth, He should not be a priest, seeing that there are priests that offer gifts according to the Law; who serve unto the example² and shadow of heavenly things.”³

The priesthood of Christ was further dissimilar from its type, in being employed about *a single sacrifice*—made once for all. To recur, as before, to the very words of Scripture. “Every priest standeth daily ministering and offering oftentimes the same sacrifices, which can never take away sins; but this man, after He had offered *one sacrifice* for sins, for ever sat down on the right hand of God;”—“for by *one offering* He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified.”⁴ “Nor yet that He should offer Himself often, as the high priest entereth into the

¹ Heb. vii. 26—28.

² Rather, exemplar or pattern. The original word is ὑποδειγματι.

³ Heb. viii. 4, 5.

⁴ Heb. x. 11, 12, 14.

holy place, every year, with the blood of others ; (for then must He often have suffered since the foundation of the world;) but now, *once*, in the end of the world hath He appeared, to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself.”¹ It was because the Levitical priests, as well as their sacrifices, were typical, that they were employed about a continual sacrifice ; and it was because Christ was the real priest and sacrifice, that He made his sacrifice once for all. To this same view may be referred all the differences between the two priesthoods, which have been now briefly enumerated. It was hence that the new priesthood not only superseded the old ; but rendered such an office as that of a sacrificing priest impossible. “ Where remission of sins and iniquities is, there is no more offering for sin.”²

The priesthood of Christ, however, and of the Levitical type which He fulfilled, comprised more than sacrifice—it was made up of this and of *intercession*. It was the priest’s office, first to prepare, and then to present, the offerings—to convey, as Mediator, the addresses of the worshippers to God. In this respect, also, the

¹ Heb. ix. 25, 26.

² Heb. x. 18.

only efficacy attached to the Jewish priesthood arose from its being the temporary representation and type of Christ; “for there is one God, and one Mediator between God and man, the man Christ Jesus.”¹ The mediatorship of Christ therefore, the only real intercessor, fulfilled and annulled the type, as in the case of sacrifice. There was “verily a disannulling of the commandment going before, for the weakness and unprofitableness thereof. For the Law made nothing perfect, but the bringing in of a better hope did, by the which we draw nigh unto God.”² But there is this important difference between the two cases. The intercession was appointed to be *perpetual*: not so the sacrifice. Christ’s fulfilment of the priestly office of intercession, did not, as in the other case, abrogate the office itself. It is not written, as in respect of sacrifice, that after He had once made intercession, He for ever sat down at the right hand of God, but “He ever liveth to make intercession.”³

This distinction as to the modes whereby the two parts of the typical priesthood under the Law have been fulfilled, requires to be attended

¹ 1 Tim. ii. 5.

² Heb. vii. 18, 19.

³ Heb. vii. 25.

to, because it furnishes the main principle which we shall have to apply in estimating the character of the officiating class in our present Temple. In proceeding now to the consideration of this, I would first observe, that in the exercise of our Lord's priestly office as *Mediator*, consists the principal connexion which at present subsists between Him and his Church. It is He, to whom unseen we are still directed as "ever living to make intercession" for us. It is of Him in *that* character, that St. John writes, "If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous, and He is the propitiation for our sins."¹

On turning to contemplate the condition of the Christian Church now, as regards its officiating class, we are immediately presented with the fact—that of the two offices comprised in the priesthood of Christ, one can be no longer exercised, because there is no more sacrificing for sin, and the other continues indeed to be exercised, but it is by Him the invisible Priest. And yet, the language of Scripture would seem occasionally to indicate the continuance of an earthly priesthood, both for sacrifice and for in-

¹ John ii. 1.

tercession. Are we to understand these expressions, then, as mere metaphors, derived from the obsolete duties of the priesthood, and employed only for the purpose of illustration? Or are we to suppose, that the Church is really admitted, in some way, to a participation of that high and heavenly character which properly belongs to Christ, and which Aaron and his descendants only personated? Let us, as the easiest method of arriving at the true meaning of Scripture, examine separately—first, those passages which seem to imply that the duty of sacrifice is perpetuated and attached to the Church—and next, those, from which we are led to infer some admission of the Church to privileges which belong to the mediatorial and intercessorial office of our sole High Priest.

“I beseech you,” writes St. Paul to the Romans,¹ “that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service;—to the Philippians,² “I am full, having received of Epaphroditus the things which were sent from you, an odour of a sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable, well-pleasing to God;”—and again to the Hebrews,³ “By Him

¹ Rom. xii. 1.

² Phil. iv. 18.

³ Heb. xiii. 15.

(Jesus) therefore let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of our lips, giving thanks to his name. But to do good, and to communicate, forget not: for with such sacrifices God is well pleased.” St. Peter again, in his first Epistle,¹ addresses Christians not only as “lively stones,” “a spiritual house;” but as “an holy priesthood, to offer spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God through Jesus Christ.” In these passages, and in others which may be added, one point is plain—namely, that the sacrifice alluded to is not *the atoning sacrifice*, which was limited to Christ alone, and of which the expiatory sacrifices under the Law were mere types. The sacrifice spoken of is the expression of praise, thanksgiving, and other devotional feelings: and it is called a sacrifice or offering, because this symbolical form of expressing such feelings had been in use during the Jewish dispensation, and for ages antecedent to it. From Abel’s offering until the last legal service of the Temple, this had been a regular method of performing to God part of the natural service of man. Considered in *this* point of view, the Jewish sacrifices were not types of Christ’s great

¹ 1 Pet. ii. 5.

sacrifice ; and He therefore neither fulfilled them, nor abolished the duty performed by means of them. The change which took place in the Christian Temple, was only a part of the general change from expression by symbol, to expression by words—from the act of offering, to the voice of praise, thanksgiving, devotion. The Old-Testament Scriptures bear testimony to this view; for in them, as in the New, we find the metaphor applied to verbal prayer. Hosea, for example, speaks of the “calves of our lips.”¹ The old Scriptures too, as well as the New Testament, dwell on the nullity of such sacrifice—of mere outward expression—unless the heart goes along with it; as, for example, in these words of the Psalmist, “The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit.”² It is plain, therefore, that the language which the Gospel-writers hold respecting a sacrifice of praise and prayer, is not peculiar to the Gospel-dispensation ; and that the duty which it expresses is no further contrasted with any service under the Law, than that formerly praise and prayer were expressed partly by symbol, and that now they are not. In both cases, sincerity and a corresponding frame of mind are requisite to give

¹ Hosea xiv. 2.² Psalm li. 17.

efficacy to the address to God ; and this service of the heart and moral conduct, is accordingly considered as the essence of the sacrifice, and even called the sacrifice. It is only the *form* of devotional expression that has been done away with by Christ's coming ; and hence (the duty remaining the same) the *form substituted* has sometimes been called the sacrifice. This was the more natural, because all such service to God still requires to be presented through the High Priest, as Intercessor and Mediator between God and man.

We come, therefore, to the second class of Scriptural expressions, those namely, which indicate, that the privileges of this mediatorial and intercessorial office, which is Christ's, are, in some sense and in some degree, imparted to Christians. I allude to such intimations as the following, which our Lord gave to his disciples while yet with them. “ In that day *ye shall ask in my name*, and I say not unto you, that *I will pray the Father for you*. For the Father Himself loveth you, because ye have loved me, and have believed that I came out from God;”¹ or this declaration of St. Paul, “ We know not what we should pray for as we ought ; but the Spirit itself maketh in-

¹ John xvi. 26, 27.

tercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered. And He that searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because He maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God.”¹ That the apostle was here representing the fulfilment of the Lord’s promise above quoted, seems the more probable from a subsequent verse of the same chapter, which is evidently connected with the foregoing.. “ Who is He that condemneth? Is it Christ, that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us?”² It certainly looks as if by the intercession which St. Paul had before represented as the joint operation of our hearts and of that Holy Spirit by which Christ dwells in us, he meant that very intercession which our High Priest in Heaven, still makes for us.

Let it not be supposed that these suggestions tend to mere speculation, on matters which are too high for us to examine. It is not, at least, in this point of view that I desire to represent them.

¹ Rom. viii. 26, 27.

² Verse 34. I have adopted what I conceive to be the right punctuation of this passage. The purpose for which I have quoted it would not however be affected by retaining that of our received version, “ It is Christ that died,” &c.

What the Lord has made known to us, doubtless, requires from us, not presumptuous scrutiny, but humble gratitude and confident conformity. On this point, however, the language of Scripture furnishes its own explanation; and exhibits a plain practical truth, which the inquirer has already perhaps anticipated. If our Lord spoke mysteriously and obscurely to his disciples, in telling them of a day when they should, indeed, ask the Father in his name, but that He did not mean by saying this, that He was to pray for them; St. Paul explains, and becomes the expositor of our Lord's words, when he teaches us the same doctrine. According to him it is the Spirit, who, by "quickeneth our mortal bodies," and "dwelling in us," "beareth witness with our spirit," "helpeth our infirmities," and makes our prayers as it were his own. "We know not what we should pray for as we ought; but the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered." The intercession is really *his*, who, residing by the Spirit in his new Body the Church, so far raises that body to a participation of his priestly privileges. "Because we are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts, crying Abba, Father."¹ It

¹ Gal. iv. 6.

is to the Church considered in its union with the Spirit of Christ that the privilege of the Intercessor — the immediate access and address is granted; and to this view of the Church, perhaps, applies the language of St. John in the Revelation, “Unto Him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father.”¹

But the Church, it should be borne in mind, inherits its priestly privileges *collectively*. It is no individual man, who is privileged to mediate and intercede for other men; it is no earthly mediator; but the Spirit of Christ in the Temple of “his new Body the Church, which is the fulness of Him that filleth it,” and who is so connected with us now.

It is necessary to keep this steadily in view, in order to distinguish the official character of the Church collectively — of the new body of the Mediator—which alone corresponds to the priesthood under the Law, from the ministerial offices of a particular class of Christians set apart from the rest for especial Divine service.

Whatever question may be made about the

¹ Rev. i. 5, 6.

precise orders requisite for a Church, there can be no question, as to two points — first, that the inspired founders designed a separate class to be set apart for religious services; and secondly, that there should be gradation and difference of ministry between them. Such was the method pursued during the exercise of extraordinary gifts; and such the system, which, in the continuance of the Church's ordinary powers, we have received from the apostles. Christians may differ about the obligation on all ages to adopt the exact gradation of Bishops, Priests, Deacons, and subordinate servants, which was found in the Church at the cessation of miracles and miraculous interposition; but the historical evidence for the existence of those different orders in that period, is too strong to be resisted by any candid inquirer.

These offices of the Church, both in the days of miracle, and now, have a two-fold object. Every separate Church is a distinct community; and one object of its offices is the rule and regulation of that community. The Church collectively (that is, the Church Universal) is also the Temple; and another object of its offices is, accordingly, the ministering in its sacred services.

If, therefore, we seek in the Jewish Church for an analogy, which shall illustrate the place in the perpetual scheme of Providence now occupied by the Orders of the Christian Church, it will appear, that so far as those offices confer authority to govern and regulate, the persons who exercise them correspond to the Jewish *civil* rulers, they being at the same time the ecclesiastical rulers. To the priesthood of the Jews, again, the spiritual officers of the Church correspond in part, and in part not. They correspond, inasmuch as they officiate in the Temple-service performed to God ; but they differ, inasmuch as that service no longer includes sacrifice, (the most prominent business of the priest under the Law,) and only comprises intercession, so far as their service is connected with the work of the One Divine Mediator, who mysteriously resides within the Church as his new body.

But the essential feature of distinction is this. The Jewish priesthood officiated in their Temple-service to the exclusion of the rest of the Church ; the officiating Order in the Christian Church have, indeed, a distinct part assigned to them, in the Service of the Christian Temple, but the Service itself is a joint common Service for ministers and those ministered unto. Our

ministerial Order exercise priestly duties; but *they alone* do not. All Christians are designed to take a share in the service of their Temple. “All have access by one Spirit unto the Father.”¹ We are all made priests unto God.²

This remarkable difference between the officiating class in the earlier and in the last Temple is an important fact to us. It carries on it (as was observed of the Jewish service) marks of Divine counsel, not of human device. A change like this, made by persons who were accustomed to an *exclusive* priesthood—in an age when no other kind of priesthood was known—cannot fail to strike a reflecting mind as highly unnatural. It was contrary to the one religious prejudice in which Jew and Gentile agreed. But the *unnatural* character of the measure appears in a stronger light, if we go one step further in the inquiry, and ask ourselves, why Gentile agreed with Jew in this prejudice? Our own hearts will tell us. It was because it is congenial to human nature. Men naturally crave after a religion by proxy. Even now, with the Gospel word unveiled and before us, and in the midst of institutions that are framed expressly to counter-

¹ Eph. ii. 18.

² Rev. v. 10.

act this propensity ; how prevalent, even now, is the feeling, that the clergy are to do the service of the Temple, not *with* us, but *for* us ; nay, that they alone, and not all in communion with them, are *the Church*. How powerful is this feeling in fostering that corruption of the Church of Rome, which has gradually assimilated its ministry to the exclusive priesthood of the Jewish Temple ! How acceptable to this tendency of the natural man is the conversion of the Communion Service into a Mass, and the restoration of the Temple's mystic veil which Christ rent at the moment of his death—the closing again of that “ way into the holiest of all, which was not yet made manifest, while as the first tabernacle was yet standing ! ”¹

Nor can we wonder that men should yield to the influence of this natural disposition. Free and universal access to the throne of grace, great and glorious privilege though it is, brings with it an increase of responsibility, which, to carnal, low, and grovelling minds, more than counter-balances the possession of such a privilege.

¹ Heb. ix. 8. Abp. Whately's Sermon, already referred to, has furnished me with this very important view. The passage to which I allude occurs at the close of the Sermon, p. 167.

The slothful servant feels as if talents committed to him for improvement—though it be a single one—is a hardship imposed by a hard master; and indolently neglects to use it, presuming that he will stand excused for his neglect, because it savours of reverential humility.

But if such persons endanger their souls, under a delusion, perhaps, that the humble estimate they make of their fitness for God's service will excuse them at the last account; if the slothful servant be threatened with his Lord's eternal displeasure; where shall the bold profaner of his Temple appear?—he who, anointed by an unction from the Holy One, officially consecrated as a member of the kingdom of priests to the service of God, has become the servant of sin? Surely “him will God destroy.”¹ To the Church, and not to a selected portion alone, are now affixed the mitre and the plate engraven, “Holiness to the Lord.” All have access in the Christian Temple, even to its holiest of holies; all have a portion of the priestly duties to fulfil; and all alike must, therefore, ever keep themselves pure, undefiled, and unspotted from the world.

¹ 1 Cor. iii. 17.

CHAPTER VI.

THE RESEMBLANCES AND THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE THREE TEMPLES, IN RESPECT OF THEIR DURATION.

CONTRASTED with the knowledge which was vouchsafed to former ages, the Christian's view of the dealings of God with man, in the mighty work of reconciling the world unto Himself, is indeed glorious. He sees—what holy men of old vainly wished to see—the true nature of the merciful provision made for man in a series of connected revelations and dispensations, from Adam unto Moses, from Moses unto Christ, from Christ still further on to the completion of the Divine purpose by the coming of the Holy Ghost to abide unseen with us. In this respect, the scriptural representation of the Gospel, as a “new creation,” is beautifully appropriate.¹ Antecedently to this the scheme of man's salvation wore the aspect of a chaos dark and formless; and the change was truly as if Christ had said, “Let there be light,” and there was light.

This very enlargement of our spiritual view,

¹ 2 Cor. v. 17; Gal. vi. 15; and compare Rev. xxi. 5.

however, is the occasion of certain new and peculiar doubts and difficulties. The more fully the Almighty has permitted and enabled us to comprehend his counsels—the more freely He has walked and talked with man—the stronger has been man's propensity to turn from what is revealed, and to pry into secret things which belong unto the Lord. He has placed the Christian—his new probationary creature—in a spiritual Eden. He has supplied him with the true bread from heaven, and the living water of his Spirit. He has opened for him a free access unto Himself; nay, He has come and taken up his abode with him, and calls him no more servant, but friend.¹ And yet, it is out of this very condition of things, that a tree of forbidden knowledge springs up before our eyes; and we can scarcely persuade ourselves, that its fruits are not as lawful to taste as they are goodly to look at.

Why did not God at once place mankind under the present dispensation? Why did not the atonement and the assistance of the Holy Spirit immediately succeed to that sad event which manifested the need of both? Why, indeed, should man have been permitted to fall; seeing

¹ John xv. 15.

that God had in store provision, which can enable him to stand, even when enfeebled by defeat, and misery, and sin? Such are the speculative questions which are suggested by our very advancement in the knowledge of God's wisdom and mercy; and which, whatever other reply may be given, ought always to be first answered by this—*It was the will of God.* All our present enlightenment still falls short of that which is to enable us to comprehend these mysteries. In our explanations and arguments, we must always admit the existence of some difficulty, for the solution of which we must be content in humble faith to wait.

At the same time it is no unimportant step to have fixed on that which is the improper subject of further inquiry—the point to which the character of *inexplicable* belongs. Having ascertained this, we may then proceed with confidence to examine and account for such difficulties as may attach to other points, which, however connected with these, are not, in this respect, similarly circumstanced.

We have, then, no possible clue to guide us in the inquiry why man was not prevented from falling, rather than assisted in rising again—we are equally in the dark perhaps about the with-

holding of the atonement and the other glories of the Gospel from Adam and his immediate posterity. But if we take up the question from the period when Scripture helps us, and thereby encourages and invites inquiry, we thenceforward trace a wise and merciful administration of grace and truth. From the earliest times of which we have any record, to the Gospel era, human nature appears to have been so grossly debased by the corruption of evil—so weak and unfit for the fullest spiritual blessings—that the delay of those blessings is no matter of surprise. They would have been lavished in vain on mankind. What sort of influence can we conceive the Gospel scheme likely to have had on the patriarchal tribes? What on the gross and degraded minds of the Israelitish bondsmen? Nay, in the days of Israel's brightest national glory, would it not have been a pearl cast to swine? Did it not actually prove so with far the majority, even when, at length, their Messiah came, in accordance with long-cherished expectation, and in fulfilment of a law under which they had been laboriously trained for 1500 years? and this too, after exile and Gentile oppression had long cured them of their worst disqualification—the passion for idolatry; whilst intercourse with various

nations had, at the same time, given them the opportunity, at least, of strengthening their understanding, and applying the intellectual powers so acquired to the comprehension of evangelical wisdom. They were, it is true, prejudiced—deeply prejudiced; and, at that time, their prejudices were the chief impediment to their reception of Christianity. But the dulness of the apostles themselves, of those who did bow their hearts to humble faith, exhibits the remnant of an inaptitude to comprehend, and to adapt the whole man to the Christian system, which in an earlier age must have amounted to utter incompetency.

All this is matter of historical fact; and with this before us, it is clear that a scheme of salvation, in all respects, gradually progressive, was that which was best suited to the accomplishment of God's merciful purpose. "When the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son;"¹ and we can so far account for the delay of that period, as to see that mankind were blessed with it as soon as they were prepared for it. We must leave to the secret counsels of the Most High the cause why man was permitted to

¹ Gal. iv. 4.

fall; but in the condition of man fallen we see all the circumstances so clearly demanding a preparatory training until the Saviour's coming, that we may discern, in the very withholding of the blessing, for this purpose, both the wisdom of God, and his tender concern for fallen man; and dwell with gratitude and edification on every particular measure and appointment so characterised.

Not the least striking instance of this appears in the difference of *duration* allotted to the three successive Temples, and to the dispensations with which they were respectively connected. The Temple of stone was continued as the abode of God, and the centre of his government and intercourse with his people, for more than one thousand years, and was then destroyed utterly and for ever. The second Temple—the Immanuel—was only for a few years exhibited to the world. And this too was demolished; but not like the Temple of stone, utterly or for ever—it was rather withdrawn and then restored, and reserved for a future manifestation. The last Temple—the Temple of the Holy Ghost—in contrast with both these, was so established, that, according to the express declaration of God, no

decay or destruction awaits it—"The gates of hell shall not prevail against it."¹

Was this striking diversity in God's successive appointments accidental? Impossible. Let us for a moment reflect how completely the object of either dispensation would have been defeated, if this very diversity had not been ordained. The Temple of stone with its appended service was needed just for so long a period as the first Church of God required preparatory training. Had it remained longer, it might have proved, like the brazen serpent of the Israelites, a snare and a source of error.² If its duration had been limited to that of the second Temple, time would not have been given for the Law to do its work of education; but, on the other hand, to have preserved the consecrated building—the nucleus of the Mosaic service—after Christianity had been established, would have been to sanction a commixture of the Mosaic and Christian dispensations wholly at variance with the true relation which they bear the one to the other. Judaism was introductory to Christianity—the Temple of stone to the Church—but in what sense was it introductory? It was not in the same manner as the

¹ Matt. xvi. 18.

² 2 Kings xviii. 4.

Law from Mount Sinai was introductory to the revelations and instructions of the prophets ; nor again, as the dispensation of Christ was introductory to that of his Holy Spirit ; for in both these cases, the earlier was not necessarily done away with by the coming of the latter ; whereas St. Paul speaks of the Gospel as, “a disannulling of the commandment going before,”¹ “a new covenant, that hath made the first old ;” adding, “now that which decayeth and waxeth old, is ready to vanish away.”² Judaism was introductory to Christianity in another sense ; it was introductory in the sense of *representing* it. The word *represent* expresses in its two-fold meaning the two-fold office which the Mosaic dispensation fulfilled, in reference to the Christian—it was the *type* or *picture* of that which was to be recognised when it came, and in this sense its *representative*. It stood also *in the place of* it, and exercised a sort of delegated virtue which it derived from the Gospel, and of which therefore the very coming of the Gospel deprived it. The Mosaic Temple being the seat of a typical religion, it was essential, in order to fulfil its object, that it should not merely be superseded, but utterly and finally destroyed. This

¹ Heb. vii. 18.² Heb. viii. 13.

doubtless, and not the Divine vengeance on the guilty generation which rejected the Messiah, was the main purpose of the eternal decree that it should never be rebuilt. Had the Jews unanimously received their Saviour, we can hardly doubt that that same destiny would have awaited God's former residence, differing only in the circumstances of national suffering which their rejection brought upon them. Had the Jews become merged in the Christian Church, the destruction of the Temple might have been even a work of holy zeal, like the breaking of the brazen serpent by Hezekiah; lest haply it should divide their heart, and either allure them back to "the beggarly elements of the Law," or mislead them into a confusion between the substance and the shadow of God's appointments.

The period allotted for the duration of the second Temple—the Temple of God manifest in the flesh, was no less in unison with the great scheme of Providence. If we measure it by the whole space of the life of Jesus, it was only thirty-three years; if we confine it, as, more properly, we should, to the period of the manifestation of his glory, considerably less. This, which would have been wholly inadequate for the purposes of the first and the third Temples, was not only suf-

ficient for the object of the second, but adapted to it far better than a longer period. In the first place, the Immanuel could not have continued with the Church after He had laid its first foundation, without assuming a character widely different from that of Founder—He must have become its Governor. This is, in other words, to say, that having provided a society to be governed by the insensible operations of the Spirit, and the law of an unvarying Record, He would, just so long as He remained, have violated the principles He was establishing, or rather have suspended the operation of his own provisions. It was, as He Himself declared, “expedient that He should go away,” for had He not gone away, the Comforter could not have come.¹ Come indeed God’s Holy Spirit might, and had, in all ages; but He could not have come (as our Lord evidently means) as the Guide and Governor of the Church. For the Church to walk by faith and not by sight, the visible guide must be withdrawn. He had remained long enough to lay the foundation of it, on principles which excluded his further manifestation in the flesh; to have remained longer would have been to nullify that which He had Himself ordained and prepared.

¹ John xvi. 7.

He had remained also with us long enough to accomplish what likewise appears to have been one benevolent purpose of his coming. The second Temple was not like the first, destroyed never to be restored. After temporary destruction, it was raised again, withdrawn, and reserved for a future manifestation. Christ came to found his kingdom on earth, and then left the world on a similar, but more glorious, errand, viz., to prepare a kingdom for the same Church in heaven. He went from his own, to meet his own again. His presence, though only "for a little while," was enough to introduce Him as it were to us—to establish an acquaintance and friendship with mankind—that, in the final abode of heaven, when, in our turn, we go to Him, we may go to a friend already known and loved. Can we doubt that such an object was intended? Let us only ask the question, what is the first natural impression made by a perusal of the Gospels? Is it not sympathy, acquaintance, and friendship with the Saviour of the world? Is not that perusal the best comment on the fervid expression of the apostle, "God is love."¹ I see no reason that so forcibly suggests itself as this for the fact, that

¹ 1 John iv. 8.

the register of Gospel truth is a biographical memoir. It might have contained equally, perhaps, for all other purposes, a statement of objects accomplished—an enumeration of an atonement, a resurrection, an ascension, of miracles and lessons. It might have been, at least, historical; merging the individual in the great results of his ministry. But it is strictly biographical. Its aim is to make us acquainted with the Lord Jesus personally, and to bring Him home to us in all that is either doctrinal or historical. The spirit that speaks to us through it, is his Spirit, still addressing us, and saying, “I call you not servants, but friends.”¹

Of the duration of the last Temple, we have the sure word of prophecy—the express declaration of our Lord. He has promised that the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. By coupling the intimation conveyed in his words to the Jews, “Destroy this Temple, and in three days I will raise it up,”² with those other words of his to Peter, “Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it,”³ we arrive at the right interpretation and full meaning of both.

¹ John xv. 15.

² John ii. 19.

³ Matt. xvi. 18.

When speaking of his own body as analogous to the Temple of stone, He said that it was *to be destroyed*, as well as raised again; and the very fulfilment of this saying, by his death and descent into the grave, must have thrown light enough on his meaning; but when speaking of his Church, his congregational Temple, He provides a hint of contrast in the remarkable words, “the gates of hell (or the grave) shall not prevail against it.”¹ The third Temple *was not to be destroyed*—not to go down into the grave—the doors of no sepulchre² were to be closed on it, as in the case of the Temple of his body. It is only to end with the end of all things in this world; and, in token of

¹ The expression, “I will *build* my Church,” *οἰκοδομήσω μον τὴν ἐκκλησίαν*,—natural and easy as it sounds to our ears, partly from our being familiar with Scripture, and partly, perhaps, from the two-fold meaning of the word *church*, an *edifice*, and a *body* of *Christians*,—must have been, at the time, very strange and striking. ‘*Ἐκκλησία* then meant only an *assembly* or *congregation*; and to give any of the original force to a translation of the Greek words, they should be rendered, “I will *build my assembly* on this rock.” The declaration implied, that the Temple to be built, under the new covenant, was to be an assembly of men. It implied this very obscurely, no doubt; but our Lord’s other declaration respecting his own body as the Temple—the residence of God—was surely sufficient to throw light on his expression, *οἰκοδομήσω τὴν ἐκκλησίαν μον*, κ. τ. λ. when the Holy Spirit called both assertions to the remembrance of the Apostles.

² πύλαι φύου.

its unchanging condition during the interval, (so far, I mean, as regards its Divine provisions,) the whole of that period has been entitled “the last days,” “the end,” and the like. Indeed, its splendid character, as comprising the fulfilment of all the preparatory types and promises, and the completion of Christ’s ministry, more certainly declares this than even such implied declarations. If the third Temple, like the former two, has been accommodated to the circumstances of the worshippers, and is adapted to the object of its appointment, we must suppose that still, as heretofore, no renewal of inspiration will suspend the sole supremacy of the sacred Record—no new display of miracles will alter the established grounds of our faith.¹ Ages may yet be requisite for that consummation of the Divine will on which the present Temple’s duration depends; but it cannot continue to be the same (as we believe it will) if changes so destructive of its essential character were to take place.

Do we presume to look farther onwards, and to inquire what that object is which is to be accomplished by the Lord’s tarrying? Of this we know no more than of the day and the hour of

¹ See *History of the Rise and Early Progress of Christianity*, Part iii. c. i.

his coming. We must wait to discover and admire the wisdom of this, for that period when we shall be looking back on the finished history of the three Temples of the One God, with a far clearer eye than we now contemplate the two. We shall then know why the fulness of the time is not yet come.

There is, however, a definite and satisfactory reply which every man may give, and ought to give, to his own heart, when it has been beguiled into speculations about the probable duration of the Church in this world. To *him* it is bounded by the period of his life. For the guidance of the individual's conduct it can make no difference whether the world and he expire in the same moment; or the change from the kingdom on earth to that in heaven be yet postponed for ages. His duties, his hopes, and his fears, must be, in either case, the same; and would be no less the same, if a view of the future were allowed him. We are told that God "hath appointed a day in the which He will judge the world in righteousness."¹ Prophecy could have added no stronger motive to holiness, no clearer assurance of responsibility, though it should have disclosed to us the day and the hour.

¹ Acts xvii. 31.

CHAPTER VII.

CONNEXION OF THE THREE TEMPLES WITH THE
DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY.

WHAT shall we say then is the natural impression which this three-fold dispensation leaves respecting its Divine Author? Temple has succeeded Temple, bearing, all, equally strong marks, attesting that in them was God's abiding presence; but differing from one another in the nature and circumstances of that mysterious indwelling, as much as if three distinct Beings had, in turn, presided over the changing kingdom of heaven. In the first, we are presented with an object of worship, made known indeed by symbol, but expressly warning his people against supposing that any symbol was a manifestation of Him. In the second, there was a sensible manifestation, and that,¹ "the image

¹ Col. i. 15. *Eἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ἀριστού, πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως.* The Apostle's language contains an apparent allusion to the Mosaic record, that "God created man in his own image." Christianity is represented elsewhere as a new creation, and Christ as a second Adam. (See *e. g.* Isa. lxv. 17; 1 Cor. xv. 45—47; 2 Cor. v. 17; Eph. iv. 24.) Might not the original declaration, then, that man was God's *image*, have had a prophetic reference to the mystery

of the unseen God;" "God was manifest in the flesh,"¹ "The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us."² In contrast with both, the last Temple is hallowed and possessed by an object of worship, whose permanent residence and presence are not recognized by our senses. There is neither Symbol nor Voice as in the first Temple, no "express image of His Person"³ as in the Second.

The differences between the respective modes of Divine government,—the extent and character of the worshippers,—the service required,—and the motives to obedience,—all present features of contrast, and often, at a casual glance, contrariety of views, no less striking. The very Temples differ more widely than any which can be compared together from among all the heathen Temples of all ages.

of the Incarnation? The same may be suggested of the wording of the second Commandment of the Decalogue, "Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven image," &c., which seems to convey a hint of the one lawful "image of God," which He, and not man, was to fashion, and before which, in the fulness of time, "every knee was to bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth," Phil. ii. 10.

Compare with the passages already referred to, 2 Cor. iv. 4; Heb. i. 3; also Rom. viii. 29; xii. 2.

¹ 1 Tim. iii. 16. ² John i. 14. ³ Hebrews i. 3.

What then could have been the impression designed to be left on us who are allowed to look back on this past progress of the diversified Divine economy? It surely must have been designed to suggest to us, and to habituate us to contemplate, God as Three. Three different Divine Persons appear as the agents and rulers, in a three-fold dispensation: so different, indeed, that if left to form our conjectures of the Divine nature from the facts of this progressive economy, all view of *one* God must have been discarded. The facts of Revelation represent God as a Trinity; and it is only by express and perpetual qualifications of a view so suggested, that we are assured of his Unity. It was important and absolutely necessary, that as each Temple arose, and exhibited a distinct Divine Person as its possessor, fresh declarations should be issued, and new signs appended to the mark of distinction, to show that it was still one and the same God in all. The doctrine of the Trinity, in short, rests primarily on historical facts; the doctrine of the Unity, on a series of declarations and other provisions made in reference to those facts. If we suppose the Bible stripped of all those provisions which it contains for qualifying its historical representations of the Divine nature, it

would exhibit three distinct Gods; with those provisions, that representation becomes a Trinity in Unity.

Having in the preceding chapters, then, examined the Three Temples in reference to the points of difference and contrast, which most strongly denote the agency of three Divine persons, I shall close the inquiry by pointing out the principal provisions made by Divine wisdom to prevent the error of supposing that these three are different Gods.

But first, let me not be misunderstood when I assert, that the doctrine of the Trinity rests on historical facts. That God has revealed Himself to man with a three-fold personality in his three-fold dispensation; and that distinct views of his nature have thus been developed;—all this is historical fact. But that this three-fold Personality involves further distinctions unrevealed, or unintelligible to us; and that the distinctions which are revealed, and understood, have a connexion with these, is what we derive, and can only derive, from the declarations of God's Word.

When the Jewish Church was established, the prevalence of heathen polytheism made it expedient that the Unity of the true God should be set forth as the most prominent feature of

belief. But it is only in accordance with the view which we take of the rest of that early dispensation, to suppose that the declaration of God's being one, was also prospective—was a provision, in short, to keep up an habitual impression of the Divine Unity, preparatory to the change, in which a new Divine person was to appear. Even as the ceremonial of the Law was probably, for the time, an antagonist system to certain religious rites of the neighbouring idolators; but contained nevertheless, as its most important object, the prophetic picture of the Gospel scheme; so, the enforcement of the Divine Unity, whilst it served the temporary purpose of a preservative against polytheism, became, and was designed to become, in the fulness of time, a corrective of error concerning the Trinity. The best preparatory course for this doctrine was an habitual contemplation of God as one. Hence not only was belief in the Unity made the subject of commandment and reiterated assertion, under the first dispensation; but the Temple was, by the most solemn injunctions, appointed to be but one. Whatever strange lands became the abode of Jews, into whatever countries they were dispersed by adventurous commerce or judicial exile; to the Temple at Jerusalem they were

bound to repair, or else to forego the service of Jehovah. No where else must a Temple be built, or sacrifice offered; although thousands should yearly, by reason of distance or other impediments, be debarred from all communion. It seemed safer and better that the service of God should be suspended, than that the Unity of His Temple should be violated. Not that this was a principle peculiar to the first Temple. The *oneness* of God's Temple was still maintained when the law was abolished. It was maintained by the change from a Temple of stone, when that became incompatible with it, to one composed of materials which adapted it to a new people of the Lord; it was maintained by Christ's going away before the Comforter came,¹ by the Temple of his body being withdrawn, before his new body the Church was dedicated, so that in the last, as in the earliest dispensation, there should still be but one Temple of God on earth, in memorial that there is only one God, and that He is to be worshipped as one.

The Unity of the Divine nature was impressed on God's people during the period of the second Temple's duration, in various ways. It

¹ See xvi. 7.

was intimated by the reappearance of the Glory that filled Jehovah's first Temple, and which now announced the human nature of Christ as the abode of the same God. It was also intimated by Christ's performing those particular miraculous acts, which God had heretofore taught his people to associate with his sole agency. For example, the cure of the leprosy was, by the most express and minute directions of the law, placed in the light of a miracle, which God did not empower his servants to perform, but performed Himself. The priest pronounced the leper clean, to testify the miraculous character of the cure, but he was not allowed to be an agent in the cure: intimating thereby, that in this the immediate and sole-agency of the Lord was to be recognised. When Jesus, therefore, healed lepers, and sent them to the priests, He assumed an office which the Father had hitherto reserved to Himself. By this sign He declared to the attentive disciple, that the God of the new Temple was the same with that of the old. To take another instance. The God of Israel, on leading his people from Egypt to the promised land, left Moses, by delegated authority, to provide, generally, whatever might be required for them. In one or two instances, however, an exception was made, and God Him-

self, not Moses, his servant, was the agent. It was not, for example, Moses, by delegated power, but God Himself, who fed them with bread from heaven. When therefore Christ wrought a similar miracle, and, as if to make the correspondence more striking, in a wilderness, what could have been the inference designed, but that it was God, the same God of their fathers, who was assuring his people of his identity, by repeating his own appropriated miracle?¹

The miracles of walking on the sea, and stilling its waves, can hardly be considered in a different light, when we remember the many passages of Scripture, of the Psalms especially, that described Jehovah's power under this image, and recollect, that it was to fishermen—to persons on whom such passages were likely to have made the liveliest impression—that these miracles were exhibited.

But the most striking instance of this was his violation of the Sabbath. It was of all the Jewish observances that, in the enforcement of which Jehovah was considered as most immediately concerned. Those who neglected attendance on the Temple, and were seduced into

¹ See *Catechist's Manual*, p. 55 (second edition).

other habits of alienation from their Law, yet revered this institution, and retained among their last scruples, that of violating its sanctity. It was that portion of time which God had sanctified, detached from profane service, and set apart as his own. It bore the same analogy to the other days of the week, that the Temple did to the land of Israel; the tribe of Levi to the rest of his people; and all Israel to the world. It was holy to the Lord, and God spoke of it as "*His Sabbath.*"¹ This observance Christ more than once publicly violated, and gave as a reason for doing so, that the Sabbath had been ordained by God, not for *Himself* to observe, but for man. "The Sabbath," said He, on one occasion, "was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath; wherefore the Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath;"² that is, "the institution of the Sabbath is not like the immutable principles of morality and virtue, with a view to which man was formed, and which are attributes of God Himself; but is a

¹ Ezekiel xx. 8.

² Mark ii. 27, 28. We cannot understand the expression "Son of Man," as used by our Lord on this occasion, to mean or to include mankind generally; for they would not be guiltless in disobeying a positive precept of God.

positive institution, made for man. Therefore the Son of man, as God, is Lord of the Sabbath; and free from its obligations." On another occasion of his expressing the same, the Jews understood Him, and attempted to stone Him. "My Father," said He, "*worketh* hitherto, and I work;"¹ meaning that He who gave them the commandment to rest on the Sabbath day, did not Himself conform to it, but continued his work in keeping up the course of nature; and that He, Jesus, was to be considered as that same Divine Being.

That this was what He meant was made more certain by his language on other occasions. When, for example, Philip said to Him, "Shew us the Father;" his reply was, "Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip? he that has seen me has seen the Father, and how sayest thou then, Shew us the Father?"² an answer which, sufficiently explicit itself, yet refers to a long train of intimations which had been previously lost on Philip—"Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip?" Again, He used such expressions as this to his apostles,

¹ John v. 17.

² John xiv. 9.

"I am in the Father, and the Father in me."¹

"If a man love me, he will keep my words, and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him."²

The actual result of all this, appears on the pages of the apostolic writings, where we find attributed to Christ that agency, which the earlier people of God were instructed to regard as the agency of the Father alone; as in this passage of St. Paul's Epistle to the Colossians, "By Him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by Him, and for Him: and He is before all things, and by Him all things consist."³ So again, it is expressly said of Him that He is "God,"⁴ "the true God,"⁵ "the great God,"⁶ "the Lord of Glory,"⁷ "the King of Kings and Lord of Lords;"⁸ all titles which were recognised as descriptive of the Father.⁹

Together with the manifestation of a third

¹ John xiv. 11. ² John xiv. 23. ³ Col. i. 16, 17.

⁴ Rom. ix. 5. ⁵ John v. 20. ⁶ Titus ii. 13.

⁷ James ii. 1. ⁸ Rev. xix. 16.

⁹ The title of *Saviour* has the same import. See Isa. xlili. 3 and 11; xlvi. 15 and 21; xlix. 26; lx. 16.

Divine Person as presiding in a third Temple, there was need of fresh provisions for declaring the Divine Unity. The need, however, was less in this than in either of the preceding Revelations. In the first place, the worshippers in the Third Temple had now the full benefit of all the declarations respecting the Unity, which had guarded their predecessors from misapprehension. Of these, the Old Testament Scriptures contained many which, must have long familiarized those who thought on them with the doctrine that God and his Spirit were one. The coming of a Divine Ruler, claiming to be that Holy Spirit, was less likely, therefore, to suggest a wrong idea of his Divine nature, than the appearance and circumstances of the Immanuel—who was, as the prophet described Him, “a new thing.”¹ From Christ’s own teaching, again, which contained on this, as on the other doctrines of Christianity, preparatory instruction, much had been learned; or rather much had been treasured up which was now explained by inspiration. He, for instance, had promised them the coming of another Comforter, designating by that term, at one time, the Holy

¹ Isa. xliii. 19.

Ghost,¹ at another Himself,² and then again the Father.³ He spoke of Him as his own Spirit,⁴ as the Father's Spirit,⁵ and the Spirit of truth.⁶

Accordingly, the especial provisions made, on the coming of the third Person of the Trinity, for preserving still the doctrine of the Divine Unity, are, in some instances, only allusions to Christ's previous instructions now better understood and applied. Thus St. John's words in his first Epistle,⁷ "He that keepeth his (Christ's) commandments dwelleth in Him, and He in him : and hereby we know that He abideth in us, by the Spirit which He hath given us," are plainly a reference to those passages above noticed, in which our Lord identified his own coming with that of the Holy Ghost ; and prepared his disciples to recognise the abode of that Holy One with them as his own residence—in St. John's inspired words, to "know that He abideth in us, by the Spirit which He hath given us."

As in respect of the Immanuel's Divine nature, that of the third Person, too, was identified with the one God, by attributing to Him an agency which had been before appro-

¹ John xiv. 26. ² John xiv. 18. ³ John xiv. 23.

⁴ John xvi. 14, 15. ⁵ John xv. 26.

⁶ John xv. 26; xvi. 13. ⁷ 1 John iii. 24.

priated to the Father, or to Father and Son identified. Thus the Spirit is represented as "searching all things, even the deep things of God,"¹ and as having raised Christ from the dead.² Sometimes, too, that which is recorded of the Father in the Old Testament, is quoted or referred to as if it had been recorded of the Holy Ghost; as in Acts xxviii. 25, 26, where the Apostle Paul ascribes to the Holy Spirit words which Isaiah declares to have been the words of the Lord.³

But the one great provision for the doctrine of the Divine Unity, which is peculiar to the last Temple, and which, as belonging to the final Revelation, instructs us that the three Divine Persons are all one God, is the form of words appended to the rite of baptism. Christians, we know, are properly speaking, baptized unto Christ; they are a continuation of his disciples, and by that title, as well as by the title of Christians, this is implied. We might have expected, therefore, that the form of Christian baptism would have been unto Christ. But it was especially enjoined, that

¹ 1 Cor. ii. 10, illustrated by Deut. xxix. 29. "The secret things belong to the Lord our God."

² 1 Pet. iii. 18.

³ Isa. vi. 8—10.

it should be unto Father, Son, and Holy Ghost ; as if to indicate that, in being baptized unto Christ, we are baptized unto that God who has been worshipped as Father, as Son, and as Holy Ghost.¹

At the time, this encouraged and obliged the Christian convert to claim connexion with the Father, lest ignorance, or error, or prejudice, should disjoin the God of the old dispensation from that of the new. But it was no temporary provision. It was a sacramental seal affixed to the great truth, that God, manifested to Christians only in his Son and by his Spirit, is still the God of the Creation, the God of Abraham, of Isaac, of Jacob, and of Moses. The baptismal form connects the earlier with the latter dispensations—the dispensation of the Law, with that of the Gospel, as provided by the Son, and taught and perfected by the Spirit. It stamps the baptized with the character of the true Israel—the true children of Abraham, and heirs of the promise made unto the patriarchs and to Adam. It teaches us that in

¹ The scriptural expression is properly “*into* or *unto* the name,” not “*in* the name” according to our version. The mistranslation probably arose from the “*in nomine*” of the Vulgate.

Christianity are comprehended, continued, and completed, all the covenants from the fall unto the redemption and sanctification of man, in whatever different ways communicated and ordained. It is a memorial to us, that although “God in divers manners spake in times past unto the fathers,”¹ and unto us in his Son, and by his Spirit, no variableness or shadow of turning in Him is implied by these differences of manifestation, and changes of dispensation. He is still “Alpha and Omega; the beginning and the ending, which is, and which was, and which is to come.”²

¹ Heb. i. 1.

² Rev. i. 8.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY GEORGE PHIPPS, BANELLACH STREET,
EATON SQUARE.

NEW AND CHEAPER EDITIONS,

PUBLISHED BY

JOHN W. PARKER AND SON, WEST STRAND.

Dynevor Terrace. By the Author of 'The Heir of Redclyffe.' 6s.

The Angel in the House. By COVENTRY PATMORE. One Volume. 7s. 6d.

Shipwrecks of the Royal Navy. By W. O. S. GILLY. With Preface by Canon Gilly. 5s.

Digby Grand. By G. J. WHYTE MELVILLE. One Volume. 5s.

Kate Coventry. By G. J. WHYTE MELVILLE 5s.

Hypatia. By the Rev. C. KINGSLEY. One Volume. 6s.

The Heir of Redclyffe. 6s

Heartsease. By the same Author. 6s.

The Lances of Lynwood. By the same Author. 3s.

The Little Duke. By the same Author. 1s. 6d.

Yeast: a Problem. By the Rev. C. KINGSLEY. 5s.

Essays Written in the Intervals of Business. 2s. 6d.

Friends in Council. Two Volumes. 9s.

Companions of My Solitude. 3s. 6d.

Gazpacho; or, Summer Months in Spain. By W. G. CLARK, M.A. 5s.

Charicles: Illustrations of the Private Life of the Greeks. By Professor BECKER. 10s. 6d.

History of Birds. By E. STANLEY, D.D., Bishop of Norwich. 3s. 6d.

Domesticated Animals. By MARY ROBERTS. 2s. 6d.

Wild Animals. By MARY ROBERTS. 2s. 6d.

The Philosophy of Living. By HERBERT MAYO. 5s.

History of the Inductive Sciences. By Dr. WHEWELL. Three Volumes, Crown 8vo. 24s.

A System of Logic. By J. S. MILL. Two Vols. 25s.
The Young Officer's Companion. By Lord DE ROS. 6s.
The Earth and Man. By Professor GUYOT. With Notes and Index. 2s.
Elements of Logic. By R. WHATELY, D.D., Archbishop of Dublin. 4s. 6d.
Elements of Rhetoric. By R. WHATELY, D.D., Archbishop of Dublin. 4s. 6d.
Elements of Morality. By Dr. WHEWELL, Master of Trinity College, Cambridge. Two Volumes. 15s.
Life of Lord Harris. By the Right Hon. S. R. LUSHINGTON. 6s. 6d.
Life of James Davies. By Sir T. PHILLIPS. 2s. 6d.
Three Weeks in Palestine and Lebanon. 2s.
First Sundays at Church. By the Rev. J. E. RIDDELL. 2s. 6d.
Lectures on Astronomy. By H. MOSELEY, M.A., F.R.S. 3s. 6d.
Bacon's Essays. With References and Notes. By T. MARKBY, M.A. 1s. 6d.
Bacon's Advancement of Learning. With References and Notes. By T. MARKBY, M.A. 2s.
History of the Church of England. By T. V. SHORT, D.D., Bishop of St. Asaph. 10s. 6d.
History of the Christian Church. By Dr. BURTON. 5s.
The Anglo-Saxon Church. By the Rev. H. SOAMES. 7s. 6d.
History of Mohammedanism. By Dr. W. C. TAYLOR. 4s.
Student's Manual of Ancient History. By Dr. W. C. TAYLOR. 6s.
Student's Manual of Modern History. By Dr. W. C. TAYLOR. 6s.
Popular Physiology. By Dr. PERCEVAL LORD. 5s.

The World of Waters. By Miss R. M. ZORNLIN. 4s. 6d.
Family History of England. By G. R. GLEIG, M.A.
Three Volumes. 10s. 6d.
Tales and Stories from History. By AGNES STRICKLAND. 5s.
Conversations of a Father with his Children. 3s. 6d.
Chemistry of the Four Ancient Elements. By T. GRIFITHS. 4s. 6d.
Practical Geodesy. By BUTLER WILLIAMS. 8s. 6d.
The Crusaders. By T. KEIGHTLEY. 7s.
The Young Lady's Friend. 2s. 6d.
Woman's Mission. 2s. 6d.
Little Bracken Burners. By Lady CALLCOTT. 1s. 6d.
Ethel Lea. A Tale. By ANNA KING. 1s. 6d.
Deaf and Dumb Boy. By Rev. W. FLETCHER. 1s. 6d.
Reverses; or, Memoirs of the Fairfax Family. 3s.
Twenty-five Village Sermons. By the Rev. C. KINGSLEY.
2s. 6d.
Sermons for the Times. By the Rev. C. KINGSLEY.
3s. 6d.
Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles. By HAROLD BROWNE, M.A., Norrisian Professor of Divinity, Cambridge. 16s.
The Catechist's Manual. By Bishop HINDS. 4s. 6d.
The Three Temples of the One God. By Bishop HINDS. 3s.
The Early Christians. By W. PRIDDEN, M.A. 2s. 6d.
College Lectures on Christian Antiquities. By W. BATES, B.D. 6s. 6d.
Commentary on the Book of the Acts of the Apostles. By W. G. HUMPHRY, B.D. 5s.

Bible Narrative. By Miss R. M. ZORNLIN. 5s.

Bible Biography. By E. FARR. 4s.

Bible Maps. By W. HUGHES. 5s.

Outlines of Sacred History. 2s. 6d.

Outlines of the History of the British Church. 1s.

Outlines of the History of England. 1s.

Alcestis of Euripides. With Notes by J. H. MONK,
D.D., Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol. 4s. 6d.

Müller's Dissertationes on the Eumenides of Aeschylus.
6s. 6d.

Demosthenes: Select Private Orations. With Notes
by C. T. PENROSE, M.A. 4s.

Epistles of Cicero and Pliny. With Notes. 2s. 6d.

Jacobs' First Greek Reader. With Notes. 4s.

Natural Philosophy for Beginners. 2s.

Treatise on the Differential and Integral Calculus. By
Professor HALL, of King's College. 8s. 6d.

Elements of Algebra. By Professor HALL. 5s.

Practical Introduction to English Composition. Edited
by J. EDWARDS, M.A. 2s.

Readings in Poetry. 3s. 6d.

Readings in English Prose Literature. 3s. 6d.

Readings in Biography. 3s. 6d.

Readings in Science. 3s. 6d.

LONDON: JOHN W. PARKER AND SON, WEST STRAND.



Digitized by Google



Digitized by Google



Digitized by Google



Digitized by Google

